

230

M72

v. 2.

BT990 .M6313 1847

v. 2

Moehler, Johann Adam,
1796-1838.

Symbolism, or, Exposition of
the doctrinal differences
between Catholics and

SYMBOLISM:

OR,

EXPOSITION

OF THE

DOCTRINAL DIFFERENCES

BETWEEN

Catholics and Protestants,

AS EVIDENCED BY THEIR SYMBOLICAL WRITINGS.

BY

Johann

JOHN ADAM MOEHLER, D.D.

1796-1838

DEAN OF WURZBURG, AND LATE PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MUNICH.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN,

WITH A MEMOIR OF THE AUTHOR,

PRECEDED BY AN HISTORICAL SKETCH OF THE STATE OF PROTESTANTISM AND CATHOLICISM IN
GERMANY FOR THE LAST HUNDRED YEARS.

BY

JAMES BURTON ROBERTSON, ESQ.

TRANSLATOR OF SCHLEGEL'S PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY.

Second Edition.

VOL. II.

LONDON:

CHARLES DOLMAN, 61, NEW BOND STREET.

M.DCCC.XLVII.

1847.

230

M72

v.2.

~~230~~

~~M72²~~

5936

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.

THE DOCTRINAL DIFFERENCES
AMONG CATHOLICS, LUTHERANS,
AND THE REFORMED.

PART I.

CHAPTER V.

DIFFERENCES IN RESPECT TO THE DOCTRINE ON THE
CHURCH.

§ xxxvi.—Notion of the Church. Combination of Divine and human elements in her. Infallibility of the Church.

It has, undoubtedly, excited surprise, and it has even been made a matter of reproach against us by well-meaning readers, that we have not, prior to all the subjects here discussed, treated of the article of Church authority. For it appears a matter of self-evidence, that any discussion respecting the doctrines of a confession, should be postponed to the enquiry into the authority which that confession follows, and the sources from which it derives its tenets. In fact, this *appears* indeed to be self-evident, if we merely look at the matter from without; and such an appearance has misled many. But, as we have made it our duty everywhere to trace the inward bond of connexion pervading

all the details of the subject treated by us, and forming them into one living connected whole, we saw ourselves compelled to accord the precedence to the matter giving light before that which receives it, and to the inwardly determining principle before that which is determined; and precisely for this reason we here insert the article on the Church, and the authoritative sources of the different confessions. History teaches us, that out of the pale of the Church, from the earliest Egyptian Gnostic, down to the two general superintendants of Weimar and Gotha,* Messrs. Röher, and Bretschneider,† Holy Writ never enjoyed the authority, which it must lay claim to among Christians, of determining by its purport their modes of thinking. On the contrary, they were always preconceived opinions

* See Röhr, *Letters on Rationalism*, p. 15. The writer, after asserting that in matters of faith and in the adoption of religious doctrines, reason alone decides, goes on to say, "The Bible is, in his estimation, nothing more than any other book. He holds its declarations to be valid only when they are in accordance with his own convictions; and these declarations do not constitute the ground of determination, for these depend on their own rational proofs, but serve merely as an illustration, that others also, wise men of antiquity, have so thought and believed."

† See Bretschneider's "St. Simonianism and Christianity, or Critical Exposition of the St. Simonian religion, its relation to the Christian Church, and of the state of Christianity in our times." Leipzig, 1832. As the result of the progress of intelligence in theological matters, in modern times, we are told by this author, "Not only is the interpretation of Scripture to be abandoned to science, but even the contents of Scripture discovered by such interpretation are to be estimated according to the sciences." This assertion, more closely analyzed, would signify that the sum total of all the truths, which the sciences in general, metaphysical as well as empirical, had brought forth, or might yet bring forth, as common property, are the standard for estimating the contents of the Bible. What then is the Deity in the opinion of Mr. Bretschneider? And what will he be yet?

—opinions derived from sources extraneous to Christianity, that were made the standard for estimating the authority of Scripture, the extent of that authority, and the mode of its use, although this might not always be so openly and candidly confessed, as in the case of the two above-mentioned rationalists. Several of the smaller religious sects,—the Anabaptists, the Quakers, the Swedenborgians, and others,—are in modern times irrefragable vouchers for the truth of what is here asserted. As regards Luther, he by no means first abandoned the faith in the Catholic doctrine of the Church, and of the relation of the same to Holy Writ, and then changed what he found reprehensible in the dogmas of the Church. Still less did he make use of the principles, according to which he formed his theory of the Church, to deduce from them his other doctrines. On the contrary, the very reverse took place *in both respects*. In regard to the first assertion, it is well known that the earliest attacks of Luther were by no means directed against the principle of the Catholic Church and her authority; nay, he declared himself at the outset ready to submit his peculiar doctrines to the judgment of the Church, and he had to endure a grievous struggle with his conscience, whereof he himself has given us a most interesting description, until he at length obtained a melancholy victory, and until the troubled spirit departed from him. Had the Catholic Church agreed to recognize his doctrine, he in his turn would ever have acknowledged her authority. And assuredly, as far as he was concerned, he would have found no difficulty in uniting two things so contradictory, as *his dogma* and *the Catholic Church*; and, as he had often succeeded in coupling, as a peaceful pair, two things inwardly opposed to each other, so he

would have made the attempt here. But, with sound perception, the organs of the Church observed, that deleterious matter was infused by him into ecclesiastical life. Summoned now, either to renounce as erroneous his peculiar doctrine of Justification, together with the propositions determining the same or determined by it, or no longer to flatter himself with the title of a son of the Church, he felt necessitated, as he was the parent of a new doctrine, to become the father of a new Church. Hence, it appeared to him more honourable to execute what *his own* spirit suggested—rather to command as a father, than to obey as a son. He now laid the foundations for another Church to be erected *by himself*;—whether on a rock, or in the sand, the sequel will show.

Yet that Luther had formed a peculiar theory of Justification, before he entertained the clear idea of founding a new Church, is only a subordinate motive for our setting forth the exposition of doctrine, before the explanation of the article on the Church. For it not rarely happens, that what is merely an effect, is already clearly recognized, while its cause, though long busy in the back-ground of human consciousness, exhibits itself only later in its full light, and with entire clearness. Accordingly, it is perhaps possible, that Luther's other tenets may stand in a relation of internal dependence on his view of the Church, although he may have been clearly conscious of his doctrine of Justification by faith alone, prior to his doctrine on the Church, and consequently may have given utterance to the former tenet, previously to the latter. The principal point is, consequently, which of the two furnishes a scientific explanation of the other? We must thus adhere to the latter of the two above-stated propositions. In the

course of our enquiries it will be made manifest, that Luther's, as well as Calvin's and Zwingli's general moral views, especially their conception of the relation of the believer to Christ, entirely pervade their theory of the Church and of Scripture, and constitute the foundation of the same. As, moreover, we consider the Catholic doctrines only in their opposition to the peculiar tenets of Protestantism, and the latter must accordingly determine what Catholic doctrines are to be here discussed, so they must also regulate the *mode* of the discussion. As thus the Catholic doctrines are in a purely passive relation, and the Protestant, if we are to pursue a scientific course, assign *the present place* to the article on the Church; so our method, quite independently of the reasons assigned in the first section, is in every way justified.

By the Church on earth, Catholics understand the visible community of believers, founded by Christ, in which, by means of an enduring apostleship, established by him, and appointed to conduct all nations, in the course of ages, back to God, the works wrought by him during his earthly life, for the redemption and sanctification of mankind, are, under the guidance of his spirit, continued to the end of the world.

Thus, to *a visible society of men*, is this great, important, and mysterious work entrusted. The ultimate reason of the visibility of the Church is to be found in the *incarnation* of the Divine Word. Had that Word descended into the hearts of men, without taking the form of a servant, and accordingly without appearing in a corporeal shape, then only an internal, invisible Church would have been established. But since the Word became *flesh*, it expressed itself in an outward, perceptible, and human manner; it spoke as man to

man, and suffered, and worked after the fashion of men, in order to win them to the kingdom of God; so that the means selected for the attainment of this object, fully corresponded to the general method of instruction and education determined by the nature and the wants of man. This decided the nature of those means, whereby the Son of God, even after He had withdrawn himself from the eyes of the world, wished still to work in the world, and for the world. The Deity having manifested its action in Christ according to an *ordinary human fashion*, the form also in which His work was to be continued, was thereby traced out. The preaching of his doctrine needed now a *visible, human* medium, and must be entrusted to visible envoys, teaching and instructing after the wonted method; men must speak to men, and hold intercourse with them, in order to convey to them the word of God. And as in the world nothing can attain to greatness but in society; so Christ established a community; and his divine word, his living will, and the love emanating from him exerted an internal, binding power upon his followers; so that an inclination implanted by him in the hearts of believers, corresponded to his outward institution. And thus a living well-connected, visible association of the faithful sprang up, whereof it might be said,—there they are, there is his Church, his institution, wherein he continueth to live, his spirit continueth to work, and the word uttered by him eternally resounds. Thus, the visible Church, from the point of view here taken, is the Son of God himself, everlastingly manifesting himself among men in a human form, perpetually renovated, and eternally young—the permanent incarnation of the same, as in Holy Writ, even the faithful, are called “the body of Christ.” Hence it is evident that the Church,

though composed of men, is yet not purely human. Nay, as, in Christ, the divinity and the humanity are to be clearly distinguished, though both are bound in unity ; so is he in undivided entireness perpetuated in the Church. The Church, his permanent manifestation, is at once divine and human—she is the union of both. He it is who, concealed under earthly and human forms, works in the Church : and this is wherefore she has a divine and a human part in an undivided mode, so that the divine cannot be separated from the human, nor the human from the divine. Hence these two parts change their predicates. If the divine—the living Christ and his spirit—constitute undoubtedly that which is infallible, and eternally inerrable in the Church ; so also the human is infallible and inerrable in the same way, because the divine without the human has no existence for us ; yet the human is not inerrable in itself, but only as the organ, and as the manifestation of the divine. Hence, we are enabled to conceive, *how* so great, important and mysterious a charge *could* have been entrusted to men.

In and through the Church the redemption, announced by Christ, hath obtained, through the medium of his spirit, a reality ; for in her his truths are believed and his institutions are observed, and thereby have become living. Accordingly, we can say of the Church, that she is the Christian religion in its objective form—its living exposition. Since the word of Christ (taken in its widest signification) found, together with his spirit, its way into a circle of men, and was received by them, it has taken shape, put on flesh and blood ; and this shape is the Church, which accordingly is regarded by Catholics as the essential form of the Christian Religion itself. As the Redeemer by his word and his spirit founded a com-

munity, wherein his word should ever be living, he intrusted the same to this society, that it might be preserved and propagated. He deposited it in the Church, that it might spring out of her ever the same, and yet eternally new, and young in energy; that it might grow up, and spread on all sides. His word can never more be separated from the Church, nor the Church from his word. The more minute explanation, how in the community established by Christ, this word is maintained and propagated, and each individual Christian can attain to the undoubted true possession of Christian doctrine, is accordingly the first and most important matter, to which we must direct attention. But as the Church is connected with the apostleship established by Christ, and can by this only maintain itself; so this, in the second place, must come under consideration. But it is necessary to premise a closer examination of the leading propositions, on which all others turn,—a more detailed exposition of the ultimate reasons for that high reverence which Catholics pay to this Church.

§ XXXVII.—More detailed exposition of the Catholic view of the Church.

When the time appointed by Christ for the sending down of the Spirit was come, he communicated himself to the apostles and the other disciples, when gathered together in one place, and all of “one accord” (ὁμοθυμαδον), they were longing for his coming. It was not while one here, the other there, abode in some hidden place: nay, they were expressly commanded (Acts, i. 4) to wait for him, while assembled in Jerusalem. At last the Holy Spirit, that had been promised, *appeared*: he

took an outward shape—the form of fiery tongues—an image of his power that cleansed hearts from all wickedness, and thereby united them in love. He wished not to come inwardly, as if he designed to uphold an invisible community; but in the same way as the Word was become *flesh*, so he came in a manner obvious to the senses, and amid violent sensible commotions, like to “a rushing mighty wind.” If individuals were filled with power from above in such a way, that, only in as far as they constituted an *unity*, could they become participators of the same; and if the hallowing of the spirit took place under sensible forms; so, according to the ordinance of the Lord for all times, the union of the interior man with Christ could take effect only under outward conditions, and in communion with his disciples. *Under outward conditions*: for independently of outward instruction, what are the sacraments but visible signs and testimonies of the invisible gifts connected with them? *In communion*: for no one by the act of baptism sanctifies himself; each one is, on the contrary, referred to those who already belong to the community. Nor is any one but momentarily introduced into fellowship with the members of the Church—to remain only until, as one might imagine, the holy action should be consummated; for the fellowship is formed in order to be permanent, and the communion begun, in order to be continued to the end of life. Baptism is the *introduction* into the Church—the reception into the community of the faithful, and involves the duty, as well as the right, of sharing for ever in her joys and her sorrows. Moreover, the administration of the sacraments, as well as the preaching of the word, was intrusted by the Lord to the Apostolic College and to

those commissioned by it ; so that all believers, by means of this Apostolic College, are linked to the community, and in a living manner connected with it. The fellowship with Christ is accordingly the fellowship with his community—the internal union with him a communion with his Church. Both are inseparable, and Christ is in the Church, and the Church in him. (Eph. v. 29-33)

On this account, the Church, in the Catholic point of view, can as little fail in the pure preservation of the word, as in any other part of her task :—she is infallible. As the individual worshipper of Christ is incorporated into the Church by indissoluble bonds, and is by the same conducted unto the Saviour, and abideth in him only in so far as he abideth in the Church, his faith and his conduct are determined by the latter. He must bestow his whole confidence upon her ; and she must therefore merit the same. Giving himself up to her guidance, he ought in consequence to be secured against delusion : she *must* be inerrable. To no individual, considered as such, doth infallibility belong ; for the Catholic, as is clear from the preceding observations, regards the individual only as a member of the whole ;—as living and breathing in the Church. When his feelings, thoughts, and will, are conformable to her spirit, then only can the individual attain to inerrability. Were the Church to conceive the relation of the individual to the whole in an opposite sense, and consider him as personally infallible, then she would destroy the very notion of community ; for communion can only be conceived as necessary, when the true faith and pure and solid Christian life cannot be conceived in individualization.

Hence, it is with the profoundest love, reverence, and

devotion, that the Catholic embraces the Church. The very thought of resisting her, of setting himself up in opposition to her will, is one against which his inmost feelings revolt, to which his whole nature is abhorrent : and to bring about a schism—to destroy unity—is a crime, before whose heinousness his bosom trembles, and from which his soul recoils. On the other hand, the idea of community, in the first place, satisfies his feelings and his imagination, and, in the second place, is equally agreeable to his reason ; while, in the third place, the living appropriation of this idea by his will, appears to him to concur with the highest religious and ethical duty of humanity. Let us now consider the first of these reasons. No more beautiful object presents itself to the imagination of the Catholic—none more agreeably captivates his feelings, than the image of the harmonious inter-workings of countless spirits, who, though scattered over the whole globe, endowed with freedom, and possessing the power to strike off into every deviation to the right or to the left ; yet, preserving still their various peculiarities, constitute one great brotherhood for the advancement of each other's spiritual existence,—representing one idea, that of the reconciliation of men with God, who on that account have been reconciled with one another, and are become one body. (Eph. iv. 11-16.) If the state be such a wonderful work of art, that we account it, if not a pardonable, yet a conceivable act, for the ancients to have made it an object of divine worship, and almost everywhere considered the duties of the citizen as the most important ;—if the state be something so sacred and venerable, that the thought of the criminal, who lays on it a destroying and desecrating hand, fills us with detestation ;—what a subject of admiration must the Church

be, which, with the tenderest bonds, unites such an infinite variety; and this unimpeded by every obstacle, by rivers and mountains, deserts and seas, by languages, national manners, customs, and peculiarities of every kind, whose stubborn, unyielding nature defies the power of the mightiest conquerors? Her peace, which cometh down from Heaven, strikes deeper roots into the human breast, than the spirit of earthly contention. Out of all nations, often so deeply divided by political interests and temporal considerations, the Church builds up the house of God, in which all join in one hymn of praise; as, in the temple of the harmless village, all petty foes and adversaries gather round the one sanctuary with one mind. And as often here, on a small scale, the peace of God will bring about earthly peace, so there, on a larger scale, the same result will frequently ensue. But who can deem it a matter of astonishment, that Catholics should be filled with joy and hope, and, enraptured at the view of the beautiful construction of their Church, should contemplate with delight, that grand corporation which they form, since the philosophers of art declare, that the beautiful is only *truth manifested and embodied*? Christ, the eternal truth, hath built the Church: in the communion of the faithful, truth transformed by his spirit into love, is become living among men: how could then the Church fail in the highest degree of beauty? Hence, we can comprehend that indescribable joy, which hath ever filled the Church, when existing contests have been allayed, and schisms have been terminated. In the primitive ages, we may adduce the reunion of the Novatian communities with the Catholic Church, so movingly described by Dionysius of Alexandria, and Cyprian of Carthage; the termination of the Meletian

schism, and the rest. From a later period, we may cite the event of the reunion of the Western and Eastern Churches, which occurred at the Council of Florence. Pope Eugenius IV expresses what feelings then overflowed all hearts, when he says, "Rejoice ye heavens, and exult, O earth: the wall of separation is pulled down, which divided the Eastern and the Western Churches; peace and concord have returned; for Christ, the corner-stone, who, out of two, hath made one, unites with the strongest bands of love both walls, and holds them together in the covenant of eternal unity; and so, after long and melancholy evils, after the dense, cloudy darkness of a protracted schism, the light of long-desired union beams once more upon all. Let our mother, the Church, rejoice, to whom it hath been granted to see her hitherto contending sons return to unity and peace: let her, who, during their division, shed such bitter tears, now thank Almighty God for their beautiful concord. All believers over the face of the earth, all who are called after Christ, may now congratulate their mother, the Catholic Church, and rejoice with her, &c."*

II. Yet it is not merely the imagination and the feelings of the Catholic which are contented by his idea of the Church, but his reason also is thereby satisfied,—and, indeed, because the idea which he has conceived of the Church, alone corresponds to the notion of the Christian Church, and to the end of revelation. It

* Hard. Acta Concil. tom. ix. fol. 985. Eugenius spoke in the same strain, when he informed the Christian princes and universities of the reconciliation in question, fol. 1000. At the same time, the Armenians and Jacobins, as the documents style them, meaning the Jacobites and Copts, renounced their errors and united with the Latins. fol. 1015-1025.

corresponds, in the first place, to the notion of the Christian Church, as is clear from what follows. Truth we cannot conceive other than as one, and the same holds good of Christian truth. The Son of God, our Redeemer, is a distinct being: he is what he is, and none other, eternally like unto himself, constantly one and the same. Not in vain do the Holy Scriptures connect all with *his person*: the more they do this, the more important is it to conceive him exactly as he really was. Certain it is that every error, in relation to his person, exercises a more or less injurious influence on the piety and virtue of its possessors; whereas a right knowledge of his person forms the surest and most solid basis of a holy and happy life. In like manner will the pure appropriation of *his work*, by, and in our souls, produce the richest, most substantial, and fairest fruits; while any falsification of that work, in any one respect, is sure to be attended with injurious consequences to practical life. As Christ, therefore, is one, and his work is one in itself, as accordingly there is but one truth, and truth only maketh free, so he can have willed but one Church; for the Church rests on the basis of belief in him, and hath eternally to announce him and his work. On the other hand, the human mind is every where the same, and always, and in all places, created for truth and the one truth. Its essential spiritual wants, amid all the changing relations of time and place, amid all the distinctions of culture and education, remain eternally the same: we are all sinners, and stand in need of grace; and the faith which one has embraced in the filial simplicity of his heart, another cannot outgrow, though he be gifted with the subtlest intellect, and possess all the accumulated wisdom which the genius of man, in every zone,

and in every period of his history, may have produced. Thus, the oneness of the human spirit, as well as the oneness of truth, which is the food of spirits, justifies, in the view of the reflecting Catholic, *the notion* of the one visible Church.

But secondly, the end of revelation requires a Church, as the Catholic conceives it; that is, a Church one, and necessarily visible. The manifestation of the eternal Word in the flesh, had the acknowledged end to enable man (who by his own resources was capable neither of obtaining, with full assurance, a true knowledge of God and of his own nature, nor of mastering that knowledge even with the aid of old surviving traditions), to enable man, we say, to penetrate with undoubting certainty into religious truths. For those truths, as we stated above, will then only give a vigorous and lasting impulse to the will in an upward direction, when they have first taken strong hold of the reason, whence they can exert their effects. The words of Archimedes, *δός μοι που στῶ*, are here applicable, and in an especial degree. The divine truth, in one word, must be embodied in Christ Jesus, and thereby be bodied forth in an outward and living phenomenon, and accordingly become a deciding authority, in order to seize deeply on the whole man, and to put an end to pagan scepticism,—that sinful uncertainty of the mind, which stands on as low a grade as ignorance.*

But this object of the divine revelation in Christ

* How beautiful are those words in the Preface for the Christmas mass,—“Vere dignum et justum est, æquum et salutare, nos tibi semper et ubique gratias agere, Domine Sancte, Pater omnipotens, æterne Deus. *Quia per incarnati Verbi mysterium nova mentis nostræ oculis lux tuæ claritatis infulsit; ut dum visibiliter Deum cognoscimus, per hunc in invisibilium amorem rapiamur,*” &c. &c.

Jesus, would, according to the conviction of Catholics, either have wholly failed, or in any case have been very imperfectly attained, if this bodying forth of the divine truth had been only momentary, and the personal manifestation of the Word had not had sufficient force to give to its sounds the highest degree of intensive movement, and to impart to them the utmost efficacy, or in other words, to breathe into them the breath of life, and call into existence a society, which, in its turn, should be the living exposition of the truth, and remain unto all times a derivative, but adequate authority; that is, should represent Christ himself.

This sense Catholics give to the words of the Lord, "As the Father hath sent me, so I send you;" "whoso heareth me, heareth you;" "I shall remain with you all days, even to the consummation of the world;" "I will send the Spirit of truth, who will lead you into all truth." Man is so much a creature of sense, that the interior world—the world of ideas—must be presented to him in the form of an image, to enable him to obtain a consciousness, or to gain a true and clear apprehension of it, and to hold by it firmly as the truth; and, indeed the image must be *permanent*, that, being present to every individual through the whole course of human history, it may constantly renew the prototype. Hence, the authority of the Church is necessary, if Christ is to be a true, determining authority for us. Christ wrought miracles; nay, his whole life was a miracle, not merely to establish the credibility of *his words*, but also *immediately to represent and symbolize* the most exalted truths; to wit, God's omnipotence, wisdom, love, and justice, the immortality of man, and his worth in the eyes of God. If we adopt the idea of an invisible Church, then neither the *incarnation* of the Son of

God, nor his *miracles*, nor in general any outward, positive revelation can be conceived; because they compromise *authoritative proofs, outward visible manifestations* of eternal ideas; and, accordingly they are by force of an internal necessity there gradually rejected, where it is assumed, that Christ has founded a mere invisible Church, since the members of such a Church need only invisible internal proofs to obtain certitude. *On the other hand, the authority of the Church is the medium of all, which in the Christian religion resteth on authority, and is authority, that is to say, the Christian religion itself; so that Christ himself is only in so far an authority, as the Church is an authority.*

We can never arrive at an external authority, like Christ, by *purely spiritual* means. The attempt would involve a contradiction, which could only be disposed of in one of two ways; either we must renounce the idea, that in Christ God manifested himself in history, to the end, that the conduct of mankind might be permanently determined by him, or we must learn the fact through a living, definite, and vouching fact. Thus authority must have authority for its medium. As Christ wished to be the adequate authority for all ages, he created, by virtue of his power, something homogeneous to it, and consequently something *attesting and representing* the same, eternally destined to bring his authority before all generations of men. He established a credible institution, in order to render the true faith in himself perpetually possible. Immediately founded by him, its existence is the *de facto* proof of what he really was; and in the same way as in his life he made, if I may so speak, the higher truths accessible to the senses, so doth his Church; for she

hath sprung immediately out of the vivid intuition of these symbolized truths. Thus, as Christ, in his life, represented under a visible typical form the higher order of the world, so the Church doth in like manner; since what he designed in his representation, hath through the Church and in the Church been *realized*. If the Church be not the authority representing Christ, then all again relapses into darkness, uncertainty, doubt, distraction, unbelief, and superstition; *revelation becomes null and void, fails of its real purpose, and must henceforth be even called in question, and finally denied.*

The truth which the Catholic here expresses, can be, in another way, made evident by occurrences in everyday life, and by great historical facts. The power of society in which man lives, is so great, that it ordinarily stamps its image on him, who comes within its circle. Whether it serve truth, or falsehood; whether it direct its efforts towards higher objects, or follow ignoble pursuits; invariably will it be found to fashion the character of its members after its own model. Hence, where scepticism has spread in a community, and has impressed its image on its bosom, it is a work of infinite difficulty for the individual to rise superior to its influence. Faith on the other hand, when man sees it firmly established, like a rock, about him, and the community, which presents a great and lively image of attachment to the Redeemer and of happiness in him—the community, we say, whose imperishable existence is faith in him, and accordingly himself,—necessarily seizes and fills up the whole mind of the individual. Accordingly, should the religious man not live in a community, which hath the indestructible consciousness of possessing the truth, and which hath the strongest

internal and external grounds for that belief, such an individual would necessarily become a prey to the most distracting doubts, and his faith would either take no root, or soon again wither.

Let us once more recur to the miracles in the history of the Christian religion, but regard the subject from a different point. A certain view of divine things, which hath once obtained full consistency among any people, or any number of nations, takes so strong a hold on the individual man, that without some higher extraneous interposition, any *essential* change for the better, that is to say, any transition from falsehood to truth, is utterly impossible. Had Christ not wrought miracles; had the labours of the apostles not been accompanied with signs; had the Divine power to work such wonders not been transmitted to their disciples, never would the Gospel have overcome the heathenism of the Greek and Roman world. Error had usurped the rights which belong to truth alone; and man, who by his very nature is compelled to receive the worship of the social state in which he has been fixed, as the true expression, the faithful image of religious truth, as it is in itself, needed, of course, extraordinary external proofs for the new order of things; and, indeed till such time as this order had been consolidated into a vast social organism. These high attestations, in favour of truth, appear most strikingly and most frequently in the life of the Redeemer himself; because the yet concentrated power of the old world was first to be burst asunder, and those who were destined to be the first-fruits of the new kingdom of God, were to be torn from its magic circle. In proportion as the boundaries of the Church were extended, and the idea of redemption

and the power of the cross were embodied in a more vigorous social form, miracles declined, till at last they had completely fulfilled their destination, and had caused the recognition of the authority that was to supply their place. In this authority, as we said above, they always continue their attestation, because that authority is their own production ; and the Church is conscious of owing her very existence to those miracles, and without them cannot at all conceive herself. Hence the fact again, that together with the authority founded by these extraordinary works of God, faith, too, in these works ever simultaneously disappears.

Hence, what a whimsical—we cannot say wonderful—race are the idealists of our time ! St. Paul, who had such a spiritual, but at the same time ecclesiastical conception of all things, instituted so living a relation between his faith and the conviction of the Lord's resurrection, that he expressly declared, “ If Christ be not risen from the dead, then is our faith vain.” And how was it otherwise possible, since in Christianity, which is a divine and positive revelation, the abstract idea and the historical fact—the internal and the external truth are inseparably united ? Our idealists and spiritualists have no need of miracles for the confirmation of their faith ! *Yes, truly, for that faith is one of their own making, and not the faith in Christ ;* and it would be indeed singular, if God were to confirm a faith so fabricated by men. No less false and idle is that idealism which separates the authority of the Church from the authority of Christ. Even in this point of view, the reverence which the Catholic bears for his Church, is fully justified by reason. As from the beginning, the abstract idea and positive history, doctrine and fact, internal and external truth, inward and outward tes-

timony were organically united; so must religion and Church be conjoined, and this for the reason, *that God became man*. Could Satan succeed in annihilating the Christian Church, then the Christian religion would be at the same time annihilated, and Christ himself would be vanquished by him.

III. The third point in which the Catholic finds his view of the Church so commendable, is, the influence which it has exerted on the cultivation and direction of the will, on the religious and moral amelioration of the whole man. We speak here no longer of the influence of a clear and firm belief of the truth on the will—a firmness of belief, which only the recognition of an outward and permanent teaching authority can produce—(of this we have already spoken)—but of a direction given to the will by a living membership, with an all-embracing, religious society. An ancient philosopher has, with reason, defined man to be a social animal. However little the peculiarity of man's nature is here defined (for his peculiar kind of sociability is not pointed out), yet, a deep trait of what determines the civilization of man by means of man, is, in this definition, undoubtedly indicated. They are only races which, groaning under the destiny of some heavy curse, have sunk into the savage state, that become from the loss of their civilization seclusive, and with the most limited foresight fall back on their own resources, feel no want of an intercourse with other nations, or of an exchange of ideas, of which they possess nothing more, or of a communication of the products of their industry and art, that have entirely disappeared. These productions, which are already in themselves symbols of the intellectual character of their authors, flow into foreign countries, dressed, as it were, in the mental habits and

characteristics of their home. Traces of the spirit of all the nations through which these productions pass are impressed upon them in their course; so that they always arrive at the place of their destination, with a wealth of a far higher kind, than that which they intrinsically possess. From all these currents of civilization is the savage withdrawn; for, because he is all-sufficient to himself, is he a savage, and because he is a savage, he suffices for himself.* When the foreigner (hostis) was synonymous with the enemy; when one's country, (Iran), included all that was absolutely good, and abroad, (Turan), all that was absolutely evil; when the gods in the east and the west, in the land of the Colchians, the Cretans, and the Egyptians, rejoiced in the blood of foreigners, what a gloomy, ferocious existence must have circumscribed nations, in this their seclusion and mutual independence! For the divinity of the nation was regaled with such blood, only because the nation itself found therein a horrible gratification, and made its own delight a standard for the joys of its deity. *The maintenance of intercourse and communion with foreigners, and accordingly, the voluntary establishment of relation of dependence on them*, is thus an absolute condition to the general civilization of man; so that the more this communion and mutual dependence is extended, that is to say, the more the notion of what is foreign disappears, the more is humanity ex-

* Persius says, "With pepper and other productions of the South, science came to the Romans." A sarcasm undoubtedly, whereby he meant to stigmatize the luxury that was at the same time diffused; *sapientia cum saporis mercibus invecta*. But in this fact lie truths exalted above all satire, although as in every thing great, much that was deplorable, every kind of vice, despotism, &c., were intermingled with this blessing.

exalted. With this general relation of dependence, the dependence of man on the domestic relations of law and government, keeps equal pace. The more polished and civilized the members of a state, the more are they bound together by wise ordinances, holy laws, venerable customs and manners, which wisely determine the mutual relations of rights and duties ; so that in fact, with every higher degree of internal freedom, the outward bonds are proportionably straitened. On the other hand, the greater the state of barbarism, the greater is the external independence ; so that the wildest savage is, in a material point of view, the most free.

What do these facts import, but a wonderful, mysterious, inexplicable, connexion of the individual man with the human race ; so that he comprehends himself better, the more he seems to be absorbed in his kind, and it is only in humanity that man is understood ? Yet, this internal emancipation by means of outward restraints, of which we have hitherto spoken, is not that which is the most interior ; and serves only as a similitude or illustration of something higher. The true emancipation from low-mindedness and self-seeking, is a problem, which, as is avowed, religion alone can solve. In the same way as civilization is determined by political life, and by obedience to the institutions of the state, yea, even by the dependence, though naturally looser, on other nations ; so is true religiousness promoted by subjection to the Church. For it is an incontrovertible maxim of experience, that the individual who is unconnected with any ecclesiastical community, has either no religion, or a very meagre and scanty one, or is given up to a distempered fancy, and a wild fanaticism ; so that in none of the three cases, can religion exert her blessed influences. On the other

hand, the more stable the ecclesiastical community to which we belong, the more will the true, interior qualities of man expand, and bloom forth in freedom ; so that he who will lead a righteous life in the Catholic Church, whereof the very principle is the real unity and vital communion of all believers, he, we say, will attain to the highest degree of moral and religious perfection. It is no insane conception—no idle phantom—no illusion of a distempered mind, which he embraces, and to which he surrenders his obedience ; but it is a reality, and a holy reality, wherein true faith, and love manifesting itself in deeds, coupled with *humility* and *self-denial* in the strongest and most comprehensive sense of the words, are nurtured. The more widely diffused the community, to which the Catholic belongs, the more defined and the more manifold are the relations wherein he stands, the more multiplied the bonds wherewith he is encompassed. But, as we said above, those very bonds, which exhibit the reality of the community, produce a result the very reverse of restraint, and establish the internal freedom of man, or promote the purest *humanity* ; for this expression may be used, since God became man. Without external bonds, there is no true spiritual association, so that the idea of a mere invisible, universal community, to which we should belong, is an idle, unprofitable phantom of the imagination and of distempered feelings, destitute of all influence on mankind. In proportion only as a religious society approximates to the Catholic Church, doth it exert a more efficacious influence on spiritual life. Here, indeed, we may observe, as shall be afterwards proved, that it is only according to Catholic principles, that a Church can be consistently formed ; and, where out of her pale any thing of the kind exists, the truth of

what we assert is confirmed, to wit, that where a ray of true Christian light doth fall, it will have the effect of binding and uniting, whereby all the doctrines tending to schism and division are, practically at least, refuted.

And what the Catholic, in the way described, feels and thinks, wishes and strives for, he finds clearly laid down in Holy Writ. The divine founder of the Church, in the following important words, enlarges, among other things, on the oneness and visibility of the community, into which those, who were to take his name, were to be received:—"And not for them only do I pray, *but for them also who through their word shall believe in me*, that they all may be one, as thou Father in me, and I in thee: that they also may be one in us; *that the world may believe that thou hast sent me*. And the glory which thou hast given me, I have given to them, that they may be one, as we also are one. I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one: and the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast also loved me." (John xvii. 20, 24.) What fulness of thoughts we find here! The Lord putteth up a prayer for the gift of unity, and the union of all who shall believe; and for an unity, too, which finds its model only in the relation existing between the Father and the Son of Man. "*In us* shall they be one:" that is to say, the unity of those believing in me is of so exalted a nature, that it is only by the communication of a higher life, by a divine principle, it can be brought about by the one faith, the same hope, and love, which are of divine institution. In the same way as the living foundation of this unity is divine, so shall it be attended with divine effects: by this unity the world shall recognize the

heavenly mission of Christ. The unity must be a visible unity,—obvious to the eyes, perceptible by the identity of doctrine, by the real mutual relations and communion of all the followers of Christ with each other; for otherwise the consequences adverted to could not be deduced from it. Thus the true vital communion of all attests the dignity of Christ, as every work vouches for its master. On the other hand, in the schisms and dissensions among believers, the dignity of Christ is lost sight of; strangers are brought not to the faith, and even those already believing are delivered up to doubt and unbelief.

In expressions a little altered, but still more energetic, the Saviour now repeats the same prayer, whose mighty theme are the conditions of the prosperity, the growth, and the duration of God's kingdom upon earth. He saith:—"The glory, which thou hast given me, I have given to them: that they may be one, as we are one. I in them, and thou in me; that they may be made perfect in one." Or, in other words, he would say:—The glorious destination, the mission which as the Son of Man I received from thee, for the glorification of thy name, to the end that I might enter into the inmost fellowship with thee (I in thee), I have transferred to them also, that I might contract the most living fellowship with them, in order that they might thereby attain unto perfect unity. "And that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast also loved me," that is to say, their oneness in all things,—a oneness not to be brought about by human powers,—oneness in believing, thought, and will; and every effort shall be to unbelievers a sign that I have worked according to thy commission, and with divine plenipotence; and that

the believers are thy chosen people, to whom, out of love, thou hast revealed thyself, as out of love thou hast constituted me thine envoy. So speaketh the Lord himself.

Paul the apostle is admirable, when, in simple words, he expounds the relation between the law and grace, between the works of the law, and faith: when he instructs us respecting the series of divine revelations, and the education of the human race by God, and respecting the laws which govern the world's history. But his philosophy, if I may be allowed so to speak, his philosophy on man's social relations generally, and on his ecclesiastical ones in particular, is, in depth, and majestic simplicity, inferior to none of his other expositions. Our reason feels itself irresistibly compelled to accede to his judgments, whether he enlarge in general on the infirmity of the individual man, and the absolute necessity of aiding it, by attachment to a community; or whether he point to the limited powers of individual reason, and show how they are dilated and improved, preserved, and rescued from destruction by means of society; or whether he remind us of the one spirit, that should pervade all diversities, or of the diversities that are permitted in the one spirit; or, lastly, represent the idea, which he spiritually contemplates, under the image of the relations of the members of the body. (1 Cor. xii.) And how doth not our bosom swell, when he calls the attention of his readers to the living foundation, out of which the new community, that had appeared in the world, and was destined to unite all nations, had arisen. It is at times, as if we felt the infinite power stirring within us, which gave existence to that society. (Eph. iv. 16.) In Christ, national distinctions, in a religious point of

view, are obliterated (Eph. xi. 15); the enmities of people he hath destroyed,—he is become our peace, and “by breaking down the middle wall of partition,” hath made one out of two. All men, in a like degree, have in him access to God; but as in Christ they all become one, so they are united with each other in one body and one spirit. (Eph. iv. 4.) All invites to this unity; the one Lord, the one baptism, the one faith, the one God and father of all. (Eph. iv. 5, 6.) The oneness of faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, is at once the reality, and the supreme ideal, which should be aimed at; and without this unity, in which the individual is strong, he is given up to every wind of doctrine, and to the craftiness of men. (Eph. iv. 14.)

These and similar passages are the foundations whereon the Catholic theory of the Church has been constructed. Hence flowed the inspired eloquence of Cyprian; hence Augustine drew his reflections on the Church, which in depth of feeling and vigour of thought, contain by far the most splendid things that, since the time of the apostles, have been written on this subject. Hence, too, in later times came the glow that warmed the iron bosoms of the chilly north, and melted them into a heat, whereby all the gold and silver of our modern European civilization were by degrees purified from dross.

To the Catholic, it appears the most trivial proceeding, when such pictures of the Church, as we have attempted to trace, are ridiculed as ideal representations, which have never had in past, nor ever will have in all future times, a perfectly corresponding reality. In fact, little is told him but what he already knows; to wit, that the idea is not the vulgar reality, and *vice versâ*: but he knows, likewise, that where there is no funda-

mental idea to any reality, there is as little truth as where no reality corresponds to the idea. He feels convinced that if, in the above-mentioned manner, the doctrine of his Church is to be seriously assailed, the gospel itself would be open to the same attacks; for one might say, "all is indeed excellent and wonderful, which is there prescribed touching the pious sentiments and holiness of conduct which *should* distinguish Christians: but do these sentiments, and this conduct, *really* distinguish them? This is the question at issue." Every thing must live according to an ideal, to which the vulgar reality is not equal; for how else could it be vulgar? The words of the Lord, "Be ye perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect," will not therefore be vain, because no man is like to God. No, woe to him who shall reject the ideal, because he finds it not perfectly represented among men.

Even the fact that at all times, from our Lord and his apostles downwards, in the midst of whom a Judas was found, there has been much evil in the Church, nay, that the evil seemed at times to exceed the good, cannot impair the reverence of Catholics for their Church. The Church, as the institution of Christ, hath never erred, hath never become wicked, and never loses its energy; which is constantly evinced, though the proof may not always be so obvious to the eye. To exhibit the kingdom of God on earth, *and also to train mankind for the same*, she has had to deal with men who were all born sinners, and were taken from a more or less corrupt mass. Thus she can never work out of the sphere of evil, nay, her destination requires her to enter into the very midst of evil, and to put her renovating power continually to the test. The Catholic Church has, moreover, experienced a long, and often

arduous, history ; she has passed through periods of time wherein all the elements of life were unbound, and in wild uproar seemed arrayed one against the other. The anterior civilization, and the social institutions, under which Christianity had hitherto flourished, were really destroyed by savage and semi-barbarous hordes ; and they were not civilized Greeks and Romans, but wild, untamed natures, who now entered into the Church, which henceforth assumed quite another form. As her priests and bishops fall not from the skies ; as she must take them out of the description of men that the age can furnish ; she could indeed for a succession of centuries boast of no Clemens of Alexandria, no Origen, no Cyprian, no Basil and Gregory of Nazianzen, no Hilary, Jerome, and Augustine, who were trained up in all the art and science of ancient Greece and Rome, before they became priests, or anywise attached themselves to the Church. And yet it is impossible to estimate the great and splendid things which the Church achieved in those troublesome times ! Upon the foundation of the same doctrine, which in more flourishing ages had been developed into a systematic form, universally received, the Church displayed her educating power. Nay, all the fulness of energy, which Christianity had manifested in the first centuries, it now again unfolded, though in quite another form ; for the matter to be wrought was totally different. Under such circumstances, there sprang up from the twelfth century a variety of sects, born of yesterday, without any historical ancestry, consisting of a small number of elect, to whom was vouchsafed the privilege of dreaming a Church, and who ventured to urge against the existing Church, that had passed through so many storms and revolutions, the reproach

that *she* had failed to fulfil her destination : and with the learning which they had received from the Church, they resisted her on account of the ignorance to be found within her. Had these creations of fancy and selfishness, which they are certainly to be considered, even if we should not deny the better elements they contained, borne the burden of ages imposed on the Catholic Church, they would in the first moment have sunk back into the original nothingness, from which they had emerged. Doubtless, examples enough can be alleged of priests, bishops, and popes, who, in the most unconscionable and unjustifiable manner, have failed to discharge their duty, when it was quite in their power to bring about a reform of morals ; or who, by their own scandalous conduct and lives, have extinguished the still glimmering torch, which they ought to have kindled. Hell hath swallowed them up. Avowals of this kind Catholics must not shrink from, and never have shrunk from : it would be even idle to attempt to elude them, for the Protestants themselves furnish an irrefragable proof of the state of manifold neglect into which the people had fallen during the fifteenth century. Never would a system of doctrine like theirs have sprung up, still less have obtained such wide diffusion, had individual teachers and priests been faithful to the duties of their calling. Truly, the ignorance could not have been slight, on which a system of faith, like that of the Reformers, was imposed as worthy of acceptance ; and thus Protestants may learn to estimate the magnitude of the evil, which then oppressed the Church, by the magnitude of the errors into which they themselves have fallen. This is the point at which Catholics and Protestants will, in great multitudes, one day meet, and

stretch a friendly hand one to the other. Both, conscious of guilt, must exclaim, "We all have erred—it is the Church only which cannot err; we all have sinned—the Church only is spotless on earth." This open confession of mutual guilt will be followed by the festival of reconciliation. Meanwhile, we still smart under the inexpressible pain of the wound which was then inflicted,—a pain which can be alleviated only by the consciousness that the wound has become an issue, through which all the impurities have flowed off, that men had introduced into the wide compass of the dominions of the Church; for she herself is ever pure and eternally undefiled.

In thus stating the view which Catholics take of their Church, without pretending to any completeness of detail, we think we have duly prepared our readers for understanding the following section.

§ XXXVIII.—The Church as teacher and instructress. Tradition. The Church as judge in matters of faith.

The main question, which we have now to answer, is this: how doth man attain to possession of the true doctrine of Christ; or, to express ourselves in a more general, and at once more accurate manner, how doth man obtain a clear knowledge of the institute of salvation, proffered in Christ Jesus? The Protestant says, by searching Holy Writ, which is infallible: the Catholic, on the other hand, replies, by the Church, in which alone man arrives at the true understanding of Holy Writ. In a more minute exposition of his views, the Catholic continues: doubtless the sacred Scriptures contain *divine* communications, and, consequently, the pure truth: whether they contain *all* the truths, which,

in a religious and ecclesiastical point of view are necessary, or at least very useful to be known, is a question which does not yet come under consideration. Thus, the Scripture is God's unerring word; but however the predicate of inerrability may belong *to it, we ourselves* are not exempt from error; nay, we only become so when we have unerringly received the word, which is in *itself* inerrable. In this reception of the word, human activity, which is fallible, has necessarily a part. But, in order that, in this transit of the divine contents of the Sacred Scriptures into possession of the human intellect, no gross illusion or general misrepresentation may occur, it is taught, that the Divine Spirit, to which are intrusted the guidance and vivification of the Church, becomes, in its union with the human spirit in the Church, a peculiarly Christian tact, a deep sure-guiding feeling, which, as it abideth in truth, leads also into all truth. By a confiding attachment to the perpetuated Apostleship, by education in the Church, by hearing, learning, and living within her pale, by the reception of the higher principle, which renders her eternally fruitful, a deep interior sense is formed that alone is fitted for the perception and acceptance of the written Word, because it entirely coincides with the sense, in which the Sacred Scriptures themselves were composed. If, with such a sense acquired in the Church, the Sacred volume be perused, then its general essential import is conveyed unaltered to the reader's mind. Nay, when instruction through the apostleship, and the ecclesiastical education in the way described, takes place in the individual, the Sacred Scriptures are not even necessary for our acquisition of their general contents.*

* We can see from Irenæus, adv. Hær. lib. iii. c. 3, how ancient the above laid down doctrine is. With the clearest conviction it was

This is the ordinary and regular course. But errors and misunderstandings, more or less culpable, will never fail to occur ; and, as in the times of the apostles, the word of God was combated out of the word of God, so this combat hath been renewed at all times. What, under such circumstances, is the course to be pursued? How is the Divine Word to be secured against the erroneous conceptions that have arisen? The general

pointed out, in the earliest controversies in the Church ; and, in fact, if Christ hath founded a Church, nothing can be more strikingly manifest than this view of the matter. Irenæus says: “ Traditionem apostolorum in toto mundo manifestatam, in omni ecclesiâ adest perspicere omnibus, qui vera velint audire ; et habemus annumerare eos, qui ab apostolis instituti sunt episcopi in ecclesiis, et successores eorum usque ad nos, qui nihil tale docuerunt, neque cognoverunt, quale deliratur ab his.....Tantæ igitur ostensionis quum sint hæc, non oportet adhuc quærere apud alios veritatem, quam facile est ab ecclesiâ sumere ; quum apostoli quasi in depositarium dives plenissime in eam detulerint omnia quæ sint veritatis ; ut omnis, quicumque velit, sumat ex ea potum vitæ. Hæc est enim vitæ introitus : omnes autem reliqui fures sunt et latrones, propter quod oportet devitare quidem illos : quæ autem sunt ecclesiæ cum summâ diligentîâ diligere, et apprehendere veritatis traditionem.....Quid autem, si neque apostoli quidem scripturas reliquissent nobis, nonne oportebat sequi ordinem traditionis, quam tradiderunt iis, quibus committebant ecclesias ? Cui ordinationi assentiunt multæ gentes barbarorum, quorum qui in Christum credunt, sine chartâ et atramento scriptam habentes per Spiritum Sanctum in cordibus suis salutem, et veterem traditionem diligenter custodientes, in unum Deum credentes.....Hanc fidem qui sine literis crediderunt, quantum ad sermonem nostrum, barbari sunt, quantum ad sententiam, et consuetudinem, et conversationem, propter fidem, perquam sapientissimi sunt, et placent Deo, conversantes in omni justitiâ, et castitate, et sapientiâ. Quibus si aliquis annuntiaverit ea, quæ ab hereticis adinventæ sunt, proprio sermone eorum colloquens, statim, concludentes aures, longius fugient, ne audire quidem sustinentes blasphemum alloquium. Sic per illam veterem apostolorum traditionem ne in conceptionem quidem mentis admittunt, quodcumque eorum ostentiloquium est.”

sense decides against particular opinion—the judgment of the Church against that of the individual: *the Church interprets the Sacred Scriptures*. The Church is the body of the Lord: it is, in its universality, His visible form—His permanent, ever-renovated, humanity—His eternal revelation. He dwells in the community; all His promises, all His gifts are bequeathed to the community—but to no individual, as such, since the time of the apostles. This general sense, this ecclesiastical consciousness is tradition, in the subjective sense of the word.* What then is tradition? The

* Euseb. Hist. eccles. lib. v. c. 27; ἐκκλησιαστικὸν φρόνημα; Com-monitor. Vincent. Lerins. c. 2, ed. Klupf. 1809, p. 90. “Hoc forsitan requirat aliquis: cum sit perfectus scripturarum canon, sibi que ad omnia satis superque sufficiat: quid opus est, ut ei *ecclesiasticæ intelligentiæ* jungatur auctoritas? Quia videlicet scripturam sacram, pro ipsâ suâ altitudine, non uno eodemque sensû universi accipiunt; sed ejusdem eloquia aliter atque aliter alius atque alius interpretatur, ut pane quot homines sunt, tot illinc sententiæ erui posse videantur..... Atque idcirco multum necesse est, propter tantos tam varii erroris anfractus, ut propheticæ et apostolicæ interpretationis linea secundum *ecclesiastici et catholici sensûs normam* dirigatur.” These words occur immediately after the conclusion of the first chapter, wherein he says, there are two ways whereby the Catholic doctrine can be distinguished from the heretical: “Primum scilicet divinæ legis auctoritate: tum deinde ecclesiæ Catholicæ traditione.” By the Council of Trent (Sess. III. c. 2) tradition is called, “Universus ecclesiæ sensus.” Sess. IV. Decret. de editione et usû sacrorum librorum: “Ut nemo suæ prudentiæ innixus, in rebus fidei et morum ad ædificationem doctrinæ Christianæ pertinentium, sacras scripturas ad suos sensus contorquens, contra eum sensum, quem tenuit et tenet sancta mater ecclesia, cujus est judicare de vero sensû et interpretatione scripturarum sanctarum.”.....Decret. de canon. Script.: “Perspiciens hanc veritatem et disciplinam contineri in libris scriptis et sine scripto traditionibus, quæ ipsius Christi ore ab apostolis acceptæ . . . traditiones ipsas, tum ad fidem, tum ad mores pertinentes, tanquam vel ore tenus a Christo, vel a Sancto Spiritû dictatas, et continuâ successione in

peculiar Christian sense existing in the Church, and transmitted by ecclesiastical education ; yet this sense is not to be conceived as detached from its subject-matter—nay, it is formed in, and by this matter, so it may be called a full sense. Tradition is the living word, perpetuated in the hearts of believers. To this sense, as the general sense, the interpretation of Holy Writ is entrusted. The declaration, which it pronounces on any controverted subject, is the judgment of the Church ; and, therefore, the Church is judge in matters of faith (*judex controversiarum*). Tradition, in the objective sense, is the general faith of the Church through all ages, manifested by outward historical testimonies ; in this sense, tradition is usually termed the norma ; the standard of Scriptural interpretation—the rule of faith.

Moreover, the Divine Founder of our Church, when He constituted the community of believers, as His permanent organ, had recourse to no other law than that which prevails in every department of human life. Each nation is endowed with a peculiar character, stamped on the deepest, most hidden parts of its being, which distinguishes it from all other nations, and manifests its peculiarity in public and domestic life, in art and science, in short, in every relation. It is, as it were, the tutelary genius ; the guiding spirit transmitted from its progenitors ; the vivifying breath of the whole community ; and, indeed, the nations anterior to Christianity, personified this their peculiar character,

ecclesiâ Catholicâ conservatas, pari pietatis affectû ac reverentiâ suscipit et veneratur." Compare Melchior. Cani loc. theol. (lib. iii. c. 3, p. 179, *seq.* ed. Venet.) on Tradition ; et lib. iv. c. 4, p. 234, on the authority of the Church.

revered it as their national divinity, deduced from it their civil and religious laws and customs, and placed all things under its protection.

In every general act of a people, the national spirit is infallibly expressed ; and should contests, should selfish factions occur, the element destructive to the vital principle of the whole, will most certainly be detected in them, and the commotion, excited by an alien spirit, either miscarries, or is expelled, as long as the community preserves its own self-consciousness, as long as its peculiar genius yet lives, and works within it. If, on the other hand, things have come to such an extremity, that the living bond, which connects the present with the past, is dissevered ; that no concurrent national effort can be called forth ; that all falls into a state of confusion ; that struggle and opposition totally efface the common characteristics of the community, or reveal them only in the opposition, which is boasted of as life ; then there is no doubt that such a people is near its downfall, that its peculiar plastic principle is already paralysed, and its Divinity has ceased to live.—“ Pan is dead,” did seamen hear resounded from every quarter, at the period of the birth of Christ.

To confine our attention, more particularly, to religious communities, we need only look to the Chinese, and the Parsi, or to the Mohammedans, and we shall be astonished to observe how consistently, throughout the course of their history, the principles, established at the outset, were applied to details, how consistently the latter were conceived and modelled by the standard of the former. Let us investigate the Hellenic Heathenism also, and the most perfect agreement between the various religious phenomena that have risen up in succession, and the primitive fundamental view, cannot

escape observation. Lastly, let us contemplate the religious sect founded by Luther himself. The developed doctrines of his Church, consigned as they are in the symbolical books, retain, on the whole, so much of his spirit, that on the first view, they must be recognized by the observer as genuine productions of Luther. With a sure vital instinct, the opinions of the Majorists, the Synergists and others, were rejected as deadly ; and, indeed (from Luther's point of view), as untrue, by that community whose soul, whose living principle he was ; and the Church, which the Reformer of Wittenberg established, proved herself the unerring interpreter of his word.

Let us now, for a moment, suppose the case, that the progenitors of nations, and the founders of the above-mentioned religions, had been real envoys from above ; then must we consider the movement, that emanated from them, as divine, yet as one which, by its transmission to those attracted by its fundamental principle, had become human ; and the later collective actions, whereof we said, that they had retained the spirit of the founder, would then be at once divine and human acts and deeds. They would be divine, because they only worked out what was originally given, and applied it to occurring relations and circumstances ; human, because this developement was carried on through the agency of men ; lastly, an unerring standard of thought and action for all those who follow such a founder ; for the breath of life, which proceeded from him, guides, like a natural impulse, the movements of the whole community. According to this type hath the infallibility of the Church also, in its interpretation of the Divine Word, been formed, and by this standard we are to judge it. All the developements of its dogmas

and its morality, which can be considered as resulting from formal acts of the whole body, are to be revered as the sentences of Christ himself, and in these his spirit ever recurs. Here, indeed, subsists between the Church and the above-named religious communities the great difference, which must ever be maintained between Jesus Christ and mere men. The institutions of the latter, even after the most consistent expansion of their vital principles, advance to an inevitable end; and their productions, however much they may have worked, according to their original spirit, possess no greater value than that spirit itself, and both, in an equal degree, sink by degrees into nothing.

§ XXXIX.—The Church as interpreter of Holy Writ, and the doctrine on Tradition continued.

On these subjects, Scripture and tradition, and the relation of the Church to both, we must now enter into fuller and clearer explanations.

Undoubtedly, on this most important matter, the records of ecclesiastical history will serve to throw the clearest light. If we except some Jewish parties, which did not so much spring out of Christianity, as wish to encumber it, in its infancy, with Judæo-national observances, the earliest sect were the Gnostics. Their doctrines on the eternal co-existence of an evil matter with God—on the creation and government of the world, by an inferior spirit, the Demiurgos—their principle of Docetism and the rest, are too well known to be detailed here. However decidedly, in the opinion, perhaps, of all who now profess Christianity, these doctrines are adverse to its nature; did the Gnostics, on that account, suffer themselves to be convinced out of

Scripture, of the perversity of their views? So far from it, they preferred to reject the Old Testament, and to declare the Gospels to be falsified!* There are certainly few who have studied the Gnostic errors, that are not seized with the deepest astonishment, how their partisans could possibly deem their whimsical opinions, the fantastic forms of their demonology, &c. to be *Christian apostolic* doctrines; and many among us perhaps believe, that we could in a single hour confute thousands of them by the Bible, and bring them back to pure Christianity. So confident did they feel in their superiority, that they were even disposed to accuse their then opponents of a want of dexterity, because they did not succeed.

But, when once a peculiar system of moral life hath been called into existence, should it even be composed of the most corrupt elements, no ordinary force of external proofs, no conclusions of ratiocination, no eloquence, are able to destroy it: its roots lie mostly too deep to be pervious to mortal eye: it can only perish of itself, become gradually exhausted, spend its rage, and disappear. But, as long as it flourishes, all around is converted into a demonstration in its favour: the earth speaks for it, and the Heavens are its warranty. Meanwhile, a new age, with another spirit and other

* Even Tertullian, in his work (de Præscript. c. xvii.) against heretics, lays down some remarkable observations, which the experience even of the second century had furnished him. “Ista hæresis non recipit quasdam scripturas: et si quas recipit, non recipit integras, adjectionibus et detractationibus ad dispositionem instituti sui intervertit, et si aliquatenus integras præstat, nihilominus diversas expositiones commentata convertit.....Quid promovebis, exercitatissime scripturarum, quum si quid defenderis, negetur; ex diverso, si quid negaveris, defendatur? Et tu quidem nihil perdes nisi vocem in contentione: nihil consequeris, nisi bilem de blasphematione.”

elements of life, springs up : this, without any points of internal contact with the past, is often at a loss to comprehend it, and demands with astonishment how its existence had been possible. But, should Divine Grace, which can alone enkindle the opposite *true life*, succeed in delivering one individual from such errors, then he expresses the incomprehensible and inconceivable nature of his former state, by saying, that he had been, as it were, enchanted, and that something, like scales, has fallen from his eyes !

As the impossibility was now manifest of convincing the Gnostics of the truth out of Holy Writ, must the Catholic Church declare, that the questions whether God created the world, whether Christ were a true man, should remain in abeyance, till these doctrines were made evident to them by the testimony of Scripture ? By no means. They were directed to tradition—to the living word ; they were told that, if even a doubt could arise as to the doctrine of Scripture, the announcement of the word perpetuated in the Church, since her first establishment, and the common faith of believers, decided the question clearly enough ; and that to this decision, all who wish to attach themselves to Christ, and choose him for the Shepherd of their souls, ought not to refuse obedience.

The teachers of the Church, indeed, by no means omitted to employ Scripture for the refutation of the Gnostics, and to appeal to its testimony in detailed expositions. But herein, one learned investigation was but opposed to another : man stood against man, and the Bible on both sides.* By adherence to Scripture,

* This fact misled Dr. Lücke, in his writing, “ On the authority of Scripture, and its relation to the rule of faith in the Protestant and the

the individual Christian could undoubtedly convince himself, that the Gnostics were involved in grievous errors. Of this he was subjectively certain: but as the adversary had the like subjective conviction, that the true Christian view of the world was to be found on his side, the objectivity of Christianity would have necessarily disappeared, if, besides the Bible, there had not been a rule of faith, to wit, universal Tradition.* Without this rule, it would ever be impossible to determine with positiveness, safety, and general obligation, the peculiar doctrines of Christianity. The individual, at best, could only hazard the assertion, this is *my* view, *my* interpretation of Scripture; or, in other words, without tradition there would be *no doctrine of the Church, and no Church*, but individual Christians only;

ancient Church; three theological epistles to Dr. Delbrück, from Dr. Sack, Dr. Nitzsch, and Dr. Lücke;" pp. 125, 141, 142, 145. Not only Irenæus, Hippolytus, Novatian, Origen, and others, prove the Catholic dogmas out of *the Bible also*, but in all ages, down to the present day, Catholics adduce the scriptural proof.

* Tertullian, in the work first cited, c. 18, makes the following luminous observations, drawn fresh from life: "Si quis est, cujus causa in congressum descendis scripturarum, ut eum dubitantem confirmes, ad veritatem, an magis ad hæreses diverget? *Hoc ipso motus, quod te videat nihil promovisse*, æquo gradu negandi et defendendi adversâ parte, statu certe pari, altercatione incertior discedet, nesciens quam hæresim judicet.".....C. 19: "Ergo non ad scripturas provocandum est: *nec in his constituendum certamen*, in quibus aut nulla aut incerta victoria est, aut par incertæ. Nam etsi non ita evaderet collatio scripturarum, ut utrumque partem parem sisteret, ordo rerum desiderabat, prius proponi, quod nunc solum disputandum est: quibus competat fides ipsa? Cujus sint scripturæ? A quo, et per quos, et quando, et quibus sit tradita disciplina, quâ fiunt Christiani? Ubi enim apparuerit esse veritatem et disciplinæ et fidei Christianæ, illic erit veritas scripturarum et expositionum et omnium traditionum Christianarum."

no certainty and security, but only doubt and probability.

Scarcely had the struggle of the Catholic Church, with Gnosticism, reached its highest point, when, in the most decided contrast with the latter, the one class of Unitarians arose ; for these, and not, as Neander thinks, the Montanists, form the contrary extreme to the Gnostics. If the Gnostics saw in Christianity *nothing but* what was divine, and in Christ recognized *merely* the divine reason, so that they attributed to the Redeemer only an apparent body, represented him as merely putting on an illusive form of man, but not taking the real nature of man, and regarded moreover the visible world as thoroughly evil ; these Unitarians on the other hand, discovered in the Saviour a mere man, enlightened by Heaven ; and consistently with this doctrine, denied the descent of the Divine Spirit upon the apostles and the Church, and the high supernatural aids of grace ; which they the less needed, as they acknowledged the existence of no deeply implanted corruption in human nature. Did the former look upon the Gospel as a plastic impulse, a divine germ of life, a celestial energy ; so the latter regarded it as a law of formation, a dead rule, an abstract notion, a pure ethical system, by application whereof the defects to be found in our otherwise excellent moral nature, may be totally eradicated. The Unitarians of this class (after falsifying Holy Writ), appealed to the same, and by the rejection of tradition, relied exclusively on its authority.* What course, under these circumstances, was the Church to be advised ? Was she to declare that every one was provisionally to follow his own

* Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. v. c. 27.

views, until results, satisfactory to each individual, could be more surely obtained from the study of Holy Writ? Most undoubtedly, if the Church had been a mere historico-antiquarian association; if she had had no conception of herself, of her foundation, of her essence, and of her task, and no sense of the power of faith. But, as she enjoyed the possession of these, she acted otherwise, and from her conduct clearly resound the words: “eternally certain is the doctrine of the Redeemer to his disciples—the written word is one with the living—that which is inscribed on paper and parchment, with that which is engraven on hearts by the power of the Holy Spirit; and the doubts, which may arise out of the former, are dispelled by the latter.” The faith existing in the Church, from the beginning throughout all ages, is the infallible standard to determine the true sense of Scripture; and accordingly it is certain, beyond the shadow of doubt, that the Redeemer is God, and hath filled us even with divine power. In fact, he who grounds his faith on Scripture only, that is, on the result of his exegetical studies, has no faith, can have none, and understands not its very nature. Must he not be always ready to receive better information; must he not admit the possibility, that by mature study of Scripture, another result may be obtained, than that which has already been arrived at? The thought of this very possibility precludes the establishment of any decided, perfectly undoubting, and unshaken faith, which, after all, is alone deserving of the name. He who says, “this is my faith,” hath no faith. Faith, unity of faith, universality of faith, are one and the same; they are but different expressions of the same notion. He who, if even he should not believe the truth, yet believes truly, believes at the same time that he holds fast the

doctrine of Christ, that he shares the faith with the Apostles, and with the Church founded by the Redeemer, that there is but one faith in all ages, and one only true one. This faith is alone rational, and alone worthy of man: every other should be called a mere opinion, and, in a practical point of view, is an utter impotency.

Ages passed by, and with them the ancient sects: new times arose, bringing along with them new schisms in the Church. The formal principles of all these productions of egotism were the same; all asserted that Holy Writ, abstracted from Tradition and from the Church, is at once the sole source of religious truth, and the sole standard of its knowledge for the individual. This formal principle, common to all parties, separated from the Church; to the Gnostic of the second century, and the Albigensian and Vaudois of the twelfth, to the Sabellian of the third, the Arian of the fourth, and the Nestorian of the fifth century—this principle, we say, led to the most contradictory belief. What indeed can be more opposite to each other, than Gnosticism and Pelagianism, than Sabellianism and Arianism?*

* With respect to the Arians, compare Athanasius de Synodo, § 13-14, 40, 43, 47; Basil de Spiritu Sancto, c. 10. "Id quod impugnatur fides est, isque scopus est communis omnibus adversariis et sanæ doctrinæ inimicis, ut soliditatem fidei in Christum concutiant, apostolicam traditionem solo æqualem abolendo. Ea propter, sicut solent, qui bonæ fidei debitores sunt, probationes e Scripturâ clamore exigunt. Patrum testimonium, quod scriptum non est, velut nullius momenti rejicientes." Compare c. 27, Augustin. lib. i. contra Maximin: "Si quid de divinis protuleris," says the Arian; "quod commune est cum omnibus, necesse est ut audiamus. Hæ vero voces, quæ extra scripturam sunt, nullo casû à nobis suscipiuntur. Præterea quum ipse Dominus moneat nos, et dicat: sine causâ colunt me, docentes mandata et præcepta

and the same formal principle can be applied to every possible mode of belief; or rather that this belief, however contradictory it may be in itself, can still make use of that formal principle, should alone convince every one, that grievous errors must here lie concealed, and that between the individual and the Bible a mediating principle is wanting.

What is indeed more striking than the fact, that every later religious sect doth not deny that the Catholic Church, in respect to the parties that had previously seceded from her, has in substance right on her side, and even recognizes in these cases her dogmatic decisions; while on the other hand, it disputes her formal principles? Would this ecclesiastical doctrine, so formed and so approved of, have been possible, without the peculiar view the Church entertained of herself? Doth not the one determine the other? With joy the Arian recognizes what has been decided by the Church against the Gnostics; but he does not keep in view the manner in which she proceeded against them; and he will

hominum." In August. de Nat. et grat. c. 39, Pelagius thus expresses himself: "Credamus igitur quod legimus, et quod non legimus, nefas credamus adstruere." Eutyches, act. i. Concil. Chalced. in Hard. Act. Concil. tom. ii. p. 186: "Ετοιμον γὰρ αὐτὸν εἶναι ἔφασκε ταῖς ἐκθέσεσι τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων, τῶν τε ἐν Νικαίᾳ καὶ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τὴν οὐνοδοὺν ποιησαμένων, συντίθεσθαι, καὶ ὑπογράφειν ταῖς ἐρμηνείαις αὐτῶν ὁμολόγει· εἰ δέ που τύχοι τι παρ' αὐτῶν ἐν τισι λεξέσι ἢ διασφαλθὲν, ἢ διαπλανηθὲν, τοῦτο μήτε διαβάλλειν, μηδὲ καταδέχεσθαι. μόνας δὲ τὰς γραφὰς ἐρευνᾶν, ὥς βεβαιότερας οὐσας τῆς τῶν πατέρων ἐκθέσεως κ. τ. λ." "He said that he was ready to receive the decrees of the holy fathers assembled in the Councils of Nice and Ephesus, and he promises to subscribe to their definitions. But, if in their declarations any thing by chance should be found either unsound or false, he says that he will neither reject nor approve of it; but search the scripture alone, as being more solid than all the decrees of the fathers."

not consider that those dogmas on which he agrees with the Church, she would not have saved and handed down to his time, had she acted according to those formal principles which he requires of her, and on which he stands. The Pelagian and the Nestorian, embrace also, with the most undoubting faith, the decisions of the Church against the Arians. But as soon as the turn comes to either, he becomes as it were stupified, and is inconsiderate enough to desire the matter of Christian doctrine without the appropriate ecclesiastical form—without that form, consequently, by the very neglect whereof those parties, to which he is most heartily opposed, have fallen on the adoption of their articles of belief. It was the same with Luther and Calvin. The pure Christian dogmas, in opposition to the errors of the Gnostics, Paulicians, Arians, Pelagians, Nestorians, Monophysites and others, they received with the most praiseworthy firmness and fervency of faith. But, when they took a fancy to deliver their theses on the relations between faith and works, between free will and grace, or however else they may be called, they trod (as to form) quite in the footsteps of those whom they execrated, and when they were able to obtain possession of their persons, even burned them.*

* The observation of Chemnitius (in Exam. Conc. Trident. P. I. p. 118, and still more further on), is very remarkable. He says, Irenæus and Tertullian, who appealed to tradition, wished only to show that tradition agreed with Scripture. “Non video, si integra disputatio consideretur, quomodo alia inde possit erui sententia, quam quod ostendat consensum traditionis apostolicæ cum Scripturâ, ita ut eadem sit doctrina, quam Scriptura tradit, et quam primitiva ecclesia ex apostolorum traditione acceperat. P. 221. Et omnia sunt sacris Scripturis consona, quæ nos et recipimus et profitemur.” Hence, he draws the conclusion, that testimonies for tradition from the second, third, and fourth centuries, could not be turned against the Protestants,

This accordingly is the doctrine of Catholics. Thou wilt obtain the knowledge full and entire of the Christian religion, only in connection with its essential form, which is the Church. Look at the Scripture in an ecclesiastical spirit, and it will present thee an image perfectly resembling the Church. Contemplate Christ in, and with his creation—the Church; the only adequate authority; the only authority representing Him, and thou wilt then stamp His image on thy soul. Should it, however, be stated, in ridicule of this principle, that it were the same as to say—“Look at the Bible through the spectacles of the Church,” be not disturbed, for it is better for thee to contemplate the star by the aid of a glass, than to let it escape thy dull organ of vision, and be lost in mist and darkness. Spectacles, besides, thou must always use, but only beware lest thou get them constructed by the first casual glass-grinder, and fixed upon thy nose.

because they receive all which was then decided through tradition against the heretics. But Chemnitius did not place himself in the right point of view. He ought to have considered, that if in the matter under discussion, Catholics appeal to Tertullian and others, the question is not respecting any particular doctrine, but about the *very principle of tradition*. Chemnitius, indeed, for the most part agrees with Catholics in their doctrinal decisions against the Gnostics; but, as regards tradition, in *a formal* point of view, he stands quite on the side of the latter. He must have learned from the writings of Irenæus and Tertullian, that the most simple and fundamental doctrines of Christianity could not even be established by Scripture. Then he proceeds farther (p. 128). “*Veteres damnaverunt Samosatenum et deinde Arium. Judex erat verbum Dei, id est, testimonia ex Evangelio quæ convincunt non calumniose judicantem.*” Certainly, and the judges of doctrine at the Council of Nice were incapable of convincing, out of Holy Writ, the Arians of their error, precisely because these were the “*calumniose judicantes.*”

§ XL.—Formal distinction between Scriptural and Ecclesiastical Doctrine.

If we have hitherto shown that, conformably to the principles of Catholics, the doctrine of Scripture is one and the same with the doctrine of the Church, since the Church hath to interpret the Scripture, and in this interpretation cannot err; so this unity applies to the substance only, and not to the form. In respect to the latter, a diversity is found inherent in the very essence and object of the Church; so that, indeed, if the divine truth must be preserved and propagated by human organs, the diversity we speak of could not possibly be avoided, as will appear from the following observations. The conduct of the Redeemer, in the announcement of His Word, was corresponded to by that of the apostles, and the Word became immediately in them faith—a human possession—and after his ascension, existed for the world in no other form than in this faith of the Lord's disciples, whose kernel in Peter he therefore called the rock, whereon his Church was, in such a way, to be built, that the powers of hell should never prevail against it. But, after the Divine Word had become human faith, it must be subject to all mere human destinies. It must be constantly received by all the energies of the human mind, and imbibed by the same. The preservation and communication of the Word were, in like manner, attached to a human method. Even with the evangelists, who only wished to recount what Christ had spoken, wrought, and suffered, the Divine Word appears subject to the law here described; a law which manifests itself in the choice and arrangement of the matter, as well as in the special plan, which

each proposed to himself, and in the general conception, and execution of his task.

But, the Divine Word became still more subject to this law, when the apostles were fulfilling their mission—executing the divine charge, which they had received; for, various questions of dispute arose, the settlement whereof could not be avoided, and on that account claimed human reflection, and required the formation of notions, judgments, and conclusions—things which were not possible to be effected, without tasking the reason and the understanding. The application of the energies of the human mind to the subject matter, received from the Lord, necessarily caused the Divine Word, on one hand, to be analyzed, and, on the other hand, to be reduced to certain leading points; and the multiplicity of objects to be contemplated in their mutual bearings, and resolved into a higher unity, whereby the human mind obtained, on these matters, greater clearness and definiteness of conception. For, every thing, that the human mind hath received from an external source, and which is destined to become its property, wherein it must find itself perfectly at home, must be first reproduced by the human mind itself. The original doctrine, as the human mind had variously elaborated it, exhibited itself in a much altered form: it remained the original, and yet did not; it was the same in substance, and yet differed as to form. In this process of the developement of the Divine Word, during the apostolic age, we may exalt as high, and extend as wide as we please the divine guidance, given to the disciples of Christ; yet certainly, without human co-operation, without the peculiar activity of man, it did not advance of itself. As in the good work of the Christian, free-will and grace pervade each other, and one and the

same undivided deed is at once divine and human, so we find this to be the case here.

The same could not fail to hold good, even after the death of the apostles, even after the Gospels and the Epistles, were written and whatever else we include in the canon of the New Testament, were already in the hands of the faithful. When, in the manner described, the Church explains and secures the original doctrine of faith against misrepresentations; the apostolic expression is necessarily changed for another, which is the most fitted alike clearly to set forth and reject the particular error of the time. As little as the apostles themselves, in the course of their polemics, could retain the form, wherein the Saviour expounded his divine doctrine; so little was the Church enabled to adhere to the same. If the evangelical doctrine be assailed, by a definite theological system, and a terminology peculiar to itself; the false notions cannot by any means be repelled in a clear, distinct, evident, and intelligible manner, unless the Church have regard to the form of the error, and exhibit its thesis in a shape, qualified by the garb, wherein the adverse doctrine is invested, and thus render itself intelligible to all contemporaries. The origin of the Nicene formula, furnishes the best solution to this question. This form is in itself the human, the temporal, the perishable element, and might be exchanged for a hundred others. Accordingly, tradition often hands down to later generations, the original deposit in another form, because that deposit hath been entrusted to the care of men, whose conduct must be guided by the circumstances, wherein they are placed.

Lastly, in the same manner as in the Apostolic writings, the truths of salvation are laid open with

greater clearness, and in all their mutual organic connexion ; so, in the doctrine of the Church, the doctrine of Scripture is ever progressively unfolded to our view. Dull, therefore, as it is, to find any other than a mere *formal* distinction, between the doctrine of Christ and that of his apostles ; no less senseless is it, to discover any other difference, between the primitive and the later tradition of the Church. The blame of this formal difference arises from overlooking the fact, that Christ was a God-Man, and wished to continue working in a manner, conformable to his two-fold nature.

Moreover, the deeper insight of the human mind into the divine revelations in Christ, seems determined by the struggles of error against Christian truth. It is to the unenlightened zeal of the Jewish Christians for the law, we owe the expositions of Paul touching faith and the power of the Gospel : and to the schisms in Corinth we are indebted for his explanation of principles, in respect to the Church. The Gnostic and Manichean errors, led to a clearer insight into the character of evil, destitute of, and opposed to, all existence as it is, as well as to a maturer knowledge of the value of God's *original* creation (nature and freedom), and its relation to the *new* creation in Christ Jesus. Out of the Pelagian contest arose a fuller and more conscious recognition of human infirmity, in the sphere of true virtue ; and so have matters gone on down to our days. It would be ridiculous, on the part of Catholics, to deny as a foolish boast of Protestants (should the latter be inclined to claim any merit in the case), that the former had gained much from the controversy with them. By the fall of the Protestants, the Catholics necessarily rose ; and from the obscurity, which overclouded the minds of the reformers, a new light was cast upon the truth ;

and such indeed had ever been the case in all earlier schisms in the Church. Assuredly, in Christian knowledge we stand one degree higher than the period prior to the reformation; and all the dogmas that were called in question, received such an elucidation and confirmation, that it would require no very diligent or long-continued comparison between the modern theological works, and those written prior to the Council of Trent, to see the important difference which, in this respect, exists between the two epochs.

The fact that the deeper consciousness of Christian truth (in itself eternally one and unchangeable), is the result of contest and struggle, and consequently matter of history, is of too much importance not to detain our attention for some moments. It explains the necessity of a living, visible authority which, in every dispute, can, with certainty, discern the truth, and separate it from error. Otherwise, we should have *only* the variable—the disputed—and at last Nichilism itself. Hence it happens (and this we may venture to premise) that where Holy Writ, without tradition and the authority of the Church, is declared to be the sole source and rule for the knowledge of Gospel truth, all more precise explanations and developements of Christian dogmas are willingly left in utter ignorance, nay, are even absolutely rejected. Guided by this principle, men can find no rational object to connect with the history of believing intelligence in the Christian Church, and must necessarily evince hostility towards every thing of this tendency, which hath occurred in the Church. Or, when they lose all confidence and all hope of freeing themselves from the turmoil of opinions, and of seeing a bright, steady light arise out of the dark chaos, they cast, in their despair, upon the Bible

the whole mass of opinions, that ages have thrown up ; and of that which is, boldly assert it could not have been otherwise, consequently exists of necessity, and is inherent in the very essence of Christianity. They do not see that, with that complaisance to acknowledge every variety of opinion, which, in the course of time, may have gradually been founded on Scripture, a destructive principle, for the solution of all the enigmas of Christian history, is laid down :—to wit, the principle that its object is to show, that the Scripture, as it includes *every* sense, hath consequently none. But all charges against the Catholic Church are reduced to this, that she has been so absurd, as to suppose the Scriptures to contain one sense, and consequently only one, and that definite, whereof the faithful, in the course of history, must ever obtain a clearer and more intuitive knowledge ; while, on the other hand, the refutation of the above-mentioned prejudice, which manifested itself soon after the origin of the Church, hath been, in the succession of ages, the peculiar task of Christian science.

§ XLI.—Tradition in a more limited sense. The Canon of the Scriptures.

From that notion of tradition, which we have hitherto expounded, another is to be distinguished, although both are intimately united with each other. Tradition we have hitherto described as the consciousness of the Church, as the living word of faith, according to which the Scriptures are to be interpreted, and to be understood. The doctrine of tradition contains, in this sense, nothing else than the doctrine of Scripture ; both, as to their contents, are one and the same. But, moreover, it is asserted by the Catholic Church, that many

things have been delivered to her by the apostles, which Holy Writ either doth not at all comprise, or, at most, but alludes to. This assertion of the Church is of the greatest moment, and partially, indeed, includes the foundations of the whole system.* Among these oral traditions must be included the doctrine of the canonicity, and the inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures; for, in no part of the Bible do we find the books belonging to it designated; and were such a catalogue contained in it, its authority must first be made matter of inquiry. In like manner, the testimony as to the inspiration of the biblical writings is obtained only through the Church. It is from this point we first discern, in all its magnitude, the vast importance of the doctrine of Church authority, and can form a notion of the infinite multitude of things, involved in that doctrine. He can scarcely be a sincere Christian, who will not attribute to a special protection of Divine Providence, the preservation of the works of those apostles, and of such of their disciples, who have made a contribution to the biblical canon. But, in taking into consideration this special protection, he cannot set aside the Catholic Church, and must, even in despite of deliberate repugnance, admit that it was that Church, which the Saviour employed as a medium for preserving to all ages the writings, that had been penned

* On that passage from the Council of Trent, cited above (Sess. iv. c. 2), "*Hanc veritatem et disciplinam contineri in libris scriptis et sine scripto traditionibus*," Pallavicini remarks as follows: "Duo per illam sanctionem intendit synodus, alterum, palam facere, fidei Catholicæ fundamenta non modo esse divinas literas, quod recentes hæretici pertinaciter contendebant; sed non minus etiam traditiones, a quibus denique dependet, quidquid certi obtinemus de legitimâ ipsarum scripturarum auctoritate."—Lib. vi. c. viii. n. 7.

under his peculiar assistance. Every learned theologian is aware, that the Gnostics, as well as one class of anti-Trinitarians, in the second and third centuries, rejected sometimes this or that gospel, sometimes the Acts of the Apostles, and sometimes the apostolic epistles; nay, even brought forward spurious gospels and acts of the apostles, and mutilated, in the most criminal manner, the genuine apostolic works, which they retained. And yet no one can refuse to acknowledge, that the visible Church, which these heretics assailed, in the same manner as is usual with Protestants,—the Church that the former, like the latter, continually denounced as the corruptress of pure doctrine, as exerting a tyranny over minds, as wicked beyond conception—that this Church, we say, was selected and deemed worthy by Almighty God, to preserve the most precious jewel of Christians! What conclusions may not hence be immediately deduced! On Luther himself, as we shall have occasion later to see, this fact made a deep impression; and he brought it forward at times, in a train of ideas, that can scarcely be reconciled with the position which, in other respects, he had taken up against the Catholic Church.

Moreover, in reference to the canon of the sacred writings, some difference exists between Catholics and Protestants. Originally, indeed, it seemed probable as if in this department very important differences would have arisen; as if the melancholy spectacle of the first ages would have been renewed, in which, according to the suggestions of caprice, or the interest of mere individual opinions, sometimes one, sometimes another portion of the Bible was rejected. It is generally known (and indeed in Berthold's and De Wette's Introductions to the Sacred Books, the reader may in part

see the passages on this matter cited from Luther), that the Reformer called the Epistle of St. James, an epistle of straw, and was not disposed to acknowledge it as an apostolic production: judged not more favourably of the Revelations of St. John, and was wont to say of the first three Gospels, that in them the Gospel was not to be found; whereas, the Gospel of St. John, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistles of St. Paul, he exalted in peculiar strains of eulogy. In this matter, the opposition between St. James's doctrine, on the relation between faith and works, and Luther's exposition of the same subject, exerted an undeniable influence. Luther preferred the rejection of this valuable portion of Holy Writ, to the amendment of his own opinions, and chose rather to question the genuineness of a canonical Scripture, than to doubt the truth of his own theory. Assuredly, if in the otherwise obscure apocalypse, there had not been found passages of extreme clearness, like the following; "Happy are they who sleep in the Lord, *for their works follow them*;" Luther would have found less to offend him in this book. The remarkable expression, "that in the Gospels the Gospel is not contained," may be explained from what has been said above, respecting the signification, which the old Lutherans attached to the word *Gospel*. Luther's prejudices, however, were not able to obscure the sounder sense of his followers; and so it came to pass, that they, as well as the Calvinists, admitted with the Catholic Church, the entire books of the New Testament to be canonical. But, in regard to the Old Testament, doctrinal prejudices prevailed; and those Scriptures, which the Catholics call the deutero-canonical,* were

* In the decree of the Council of Trent on the canonical Scriptures,

gradually expunged from the Canon, yet more decidedly on the part of the Calvinists, than of the Lutherans. Among the modern Protestants, Clausen, at least, has not denied, that in this matter regard was paid to other considerations, than those of a merely historical and critical kind.

§ XLII.—On the relation of the Ecclesiastical Interpretation of Holy Writ to the learned and scientific exegesis. Patristic authority and free investigation.

As the notion of doctrinal tradition,* and of the ecclesiastical interpretation of Holy Writ, has been now fully

Sess. iv. the following is the catalogue of the Old Testament Scriptures: “Sunt infrascripti: Testamenti veteris, quinque Moysis, id est, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numeri, Deuteronomium: Josue, Judicum, Ruth, quatuor Regum, duo Paralipomenon, Esdra primus et secundus, qui dicitur Nehemias, Tobias, Judith, Hester, Job, Psalterium Davidicum centum quinquaginta psalmorum, Parabolæ, Ecclesiastes, Canticum Canticorum, Sapientia, Ecclesiasticus, Isaias, Hieremias cum Baruch, Ezechiel, Daniel, duodecim Prophetæ minores, id est, Osea, Joel, Amos, Abdias, Jonas, Micheas, Naum, Abacuc, Sophonias, Aggæus, Zacharias, Malachias, duo Machabæorum primus et secundus.”

The French Protestant confession of faith, called the Gallican Confession, l. c. p. 111, gives the following canon of the writings of the Old Testament: “Quinque libri Moysis, nempe . . . Josue, Judices, Ruth, Samuelis l. 2, Regum l. 2, Chronicon, sive Paralipomenon l. 2, Esdræ lib. i, Nehemias, Ester, Job, Psalmi, Proverbia, Ecclesiastes, Canticum Canticorum, Esaias, Jeremias cum Lament., Ezechiel, Daniel, Minores Prophetæ 12 nempe.” There are here wanting Tobias, Judith, Baruch, Sapientia, Ecclesiasticus, Machabæorum primus et secundus.

N.B. The Scriptural canon of the Anglican Church is the same with that of the French Protestants as here given.—*Trans.*

* We do not speak here of disciplinary, liturgical, and other kinds of tradition.

unfolded, it is necessary, in order to obviate some singular misconceptions, to state, in a few words, the relation between the learned exegesis as applied to the sacred writings, and that interpretation which emanates from the Church. The interpretation of the Church does not descend to the details, which must claim the attention of the scientific exegetist. Thus, for example, it does not hold it for a duty, nor include it in the compass of its rights, to determine when, by whom, and for what object the Book of Job was written ; or what particular inducement engaged St. John to publish his gospel, or the Apostle Paul to address an epistle to the Romans ; in what order of time the epistles of this messenger of the Lord followed each other, &c. &c. As little doth the Church explain particular words and verses, their bearings one to the other, or the connexion existing between larger portions of a sacred book. Antiquities, in the widest sense of the word, fall not within the domain of her interpretation ; in short, that interpretation extends only to doctrines of faith and morals. Thus much as to the extent of her interpretation.

But now as to the nature and mode of the Church's interpretation ; this is not conducted according to the rules and well-known aids of an historical and grammatical exegesis, whereby the individual seeks to obtain scientific insight into the sense of Holy Writ. On the contrary, the doctrinal contents of Scripture she designates in the general spirit of Scripture. Hence, the earliest œcumenical councils did not even adduce any particular scriptural texts, in support of their dogmatic decrees ; and Catholic theologians teach with general concurrence, and quite in the spirit of the Church, that even a Scriptural proof in favour of a decree held to

be infallible, is not itself infallible, but only the dogma as defined. The deepest reason for this conduct of the Church, lies in the indisputable truth, that she was not founded by Holy Writ, but already existed before its several parts appeared. The certainty which she has of the truth of her own doctrines, is an immediate one, for she received her dogmas from the lips of Christ and the apostles; and by the power of the Divine Spirit, they are indelibly stamped on her consciousness, or as Irenæus expresses it, on her heart. If the Church were to endeavour, by learned investigation, to seek her doctrines, she would fall into the most absurd inconsistency, and annihilate her very self. For, as it would be the Church that should institute the enquiry, her existence would be presupposed; and yet, as she would have first to find out her own being, the thing whereby and wherein she absolutely consists, namely, Divine Truth, her non-existence must at the same time be presupposed! She would have to go in search of herself, and this a madman only could do: she would be like the man, that would examine the papers written by himself, in order to discover whether he really existed! The essential matter of Holy Writ, is eternally present in the Church, because it is her heart's-blood—her breath—her soul—her all. She exists only by Christ, and yet she must have to find him out! Whoever seriously reflects on the signification of those words of Christ, "I am with ye even to the consummation of the world," will be able to conceive at least the view, which the Catholic Church takes of herself.

What we have said involves the limits prescribed to the freedom of the Catholic scholar, in the interpretation of Holy Writ. It is evident, of course, that we speak not here of that general freedom possessed by

every man, at the peril of his own soul, like the Jew and the Heathen, to hold the Bible as the work of impostors or dupes, as a medley of truth and error, wisdom and folly. This freedom the Catholic possesses, like the Protestant ; but we speak of that freedom only which the Catholic enjoys, when he will not renounce his character as Catholic ; for were he to entertain the above-mentioned view of the Sacred Scriptures, he would thereby renounce all connexion with our Church. As a Catholic, he is freely convinced, that the Church is a divine institution, upheld by supernal aid, “ which leads her into all truth ;” that, consequently, no doctrine rejected by her is contained in Scripture ; that with the latter, on the contrary, her dogmas perfectly coincide, though many particulars may not be verbally set forth in Holy Writ. Accordingly he has the conviction, that the Scripture, for example, doth not teach that Christ is a mere man ; nay, he is certain, that it represents him also as God. Inasmuch as he professes this belief, he is not free to profess the contrary, for he would contradict himself ; in the same way as a man, who has resolved to remain chaste, cannot be unchaste, without violating his resolution. To this restriction, which every one most probably will consider rational, the Catholic Church subjects her members, and consequently, also, the learned exegetists of Scripture. A Church which would authorize any one to find what he pleased in Scripture, and without any foundation to declare it as unecclesiastical, such a Church would thereby declare, that it believed in nothing, and was devoid of all doctrines ; for the mere possession of the Bible no more constitutes a Church, than the possession of the faculty of reason renders any one really rational. Such a Church would in fact, as a moral entity, exhibit the

contradiction just adverted to, which a physical being could not be guilty of. The individual cannot at one and the same time believe, and not believe, a particular point of doctrine. But if a Church, which consists of a union of many individuals, permitted every member, as such, to receive or to reject at his pleasure, any article of faith, it would fall into this very contradiction, and would be a monster of unbelief, indifferent to the most opposite doctrines, which we might, indeed, on our behalf, honour with the finest epithets, but certainly not denominate a Church. The Church must train up souls for the kingdom of God, which is founded on definite facts and truths, that are eternally unchangeable: and so a Church, that knows no such immutable dogmas, is like to a teacher, that knows not what he should teach. The Church has to stamp the image of Christ on humanity; but Christ is not sometimes this, and sometimes that, but eternally the same. She has to breathe into the hearts of men the word of God, that came down from heaven: but this word is no vague, empty sound, whereof we can make what we will.

That, accordingly, the principles of the Catholic Church agree with the idea of a positive Church, and the claim is but natural, which she exacts of her members, to recognize in the Bible, when they make it the subject of a learned exegesis, those doctrines of faith and morality, which they themselves acknowledge to be biblical, we trust we have now made sufficiently evident. In other respects, no one belonging to the Catholic Church professes aught else, than her doctrines of faith and morality. For, in this respect only, she expresses the sense of Holy Writ, and indeed only in a general way; so that the learned expositor, by the laws of his religious community, is bound to nothing

more ; and a wide field is ever open to him, whereon he may exert his talents, his hermeneutical skill, his philological and archæological learning, and employ them usefully for the advancement of science.

But, if we should be reminded of the decree of the Council of Trent, which directs the Catholic to interpret the Scripture, according to the unanimous testimony of the holy fathers,* how can we escape the reproach, that an *absolutely* sacred exegesis hath existed for centuries, and that consequently all idea of progress in the understanding of the Bible must be given up? Before we lay down the Catholic view of this subject, it may be proper to state, with the utmost succinctness, the relation of patristic authority to learned investigation. Whoever takes the pains to study the writings of the holy fathers, may without much penetration discover, that while agreeing perfectly on all ecclesiastical dogmas, they yet expatiate most variously on the doctrines of Christian faith and morality. The mode and form, wherein they appropriate the one Gospel to themselves, demonstrate its truth to others, develope it in their own interior, and philosophize and speculate upon its doctrines, most strikingly evince the individuality of each writer. One manifests a deeper, the other a clearer and acuter view of his subject ; one turns this, the other that talent to profit. While now all Catholics gladly profess the same dogmas with the fathers of the Church, the individual opinions, the mere human views of the latter, possess in their estimation no further value, but as they present reasonable grounds

* Conc. Trid. Sess. iv, decret. de edit. et usû sacrar. libror. " Ut nemo contra unanimen consensum Patrum ipsam Scripturam sacram interpretari audeat."

for acceptance, or as any peculiar affinity of mind may exist between one father of the Church, and a Catholic of a subsequent age. These principles, at all periods of the Church, were openly professed, and brought into practice. Never did any father, not even the most revered, succeed in imposing his own peculiar opinions on the Church; as of this fact, St. Augustine furnishes a remarkable proof. What writer ever acquired greater authority than he? Yet, his theory respecting original sin and grace, never became the doctrine of the Church; and herein precisely he showed himself a good Catholic, that he gave us the permission to examine his private opinions,* and to retain only what was sound. More-

* Augustin. contra Faustum Manich. lib. ii. c. 5. “Id genus literarum, quæ non præcipiendi auctoritate, sed proficiendi exercitatione scribuntur a nobis, non cum credendi necessitate; sed cum judicandi libertate legendum est; cui tamen ne intercluderetur locus et adimeretur posteris ad quæstiones difficiles tractandas, atque versandas, *linguæ ac stili saluberrimus labor*, distincta est a posterioribus libris excellentia canonicæ auctoritatis V. et N. Testamenti, quæ apostolorum confirmata temporibus, per successiones episcoporum et propagationes ecclesiarum tanquam in sede quâdam sublimiter constituta est, cui serviat omnis fidelis et pius intellectus. Ibi si quid velut absurdum noverit, non licet dicere, auctor hujus libri non tenuit veritatem: sed, aut codex mendosus est, aut interpretes erravit, aut tu non intelligis. In opusculis autem posteriorum, quæ libris innumerabilibus continentur, sed nullo modo illi sacratissimæ canonicarum scripturarum excellentiæ coæquantur, etiam in quibuscunque eorum invenitur eadem veritas, longe tamen est impar auctoritas. Itaque in eis, si qua forte propterea dissonare putantur a vero, quia non ut dicta sunt intelliguntur; tamen liberum ibi habet lector auditorve judicium, quo vel approbet, quod placuerit, vel improbat quod offenderit. Et ideo cuncta ejusmodi, nisi vel certâ ratione, vel ex illâ canonicâ auctoritate defendantur, ut demonstretur sive omnino ita esse, sive fieri potuisse, quod ibi disputatum est, vel narratum: si cui displicuerit, aut credere noluerit, non reprehenditur. In illâ vero canonicâ eminentiâ ss. literarum, etiamsi unus propheta, seu apostolus, aut evangelista, aliquid in

over, the expression, "doctrine of the fathers," is frequently synonymous with tradition: in this sense they are considered as representatives of *the faith* of antiquity—as channels and witnesses of transmitted doctrine; but by no means so when, upon a thousand

suis literis posuisse ipsa canonis confirmatione declaratur, non licet dubitare quod verum sit: alioquin nulla erit pagina, qua humanæ imperitiæ regatur infirmitas, si librorum saluberrima auctoritas aut contenta penitus aboletur, aut interminata confunditur." *Thomas Aquin.* Sum. tot. theolog. P. I. q. 1, art. 8, edit. Caj. Lugd. 1580, p. 10. "Auctoritatibus canonice scripturæ utitur (sacra doctrina) proprie ex necessitate argumentando: auctoritatibus autem aliorum doctorum ecclesiæ quasi arguendo ex propriis, sed probabiliter. Innititur enim fides nostra revelationi apostolis et prophetis factæ, qui canonicos libros scripsere, non autem revelationi, si qua fuit aliis doctoribus facta." Unde dicit Augustinus in epistolâ ad Hieronymum (xix): "Solis enim scripturarum libris, qui canonici appellantur, didici hunc honorem deferre, ut nullum auctorem eorum in scribendo errasse aliquid firmissime credam. Alios autem ita lego, ut quantalibet sanctitate doctrinaque præpolleant, non ideo vero putem, quod ipsi ita senserunt vel scripserunt."

Catholics distinguish very well between the *testimony* of the father of the Church, as to the universal belief of his time, and his own philosophy or theological speculations. In the latter respect, the views of the fathers are considered by us as mere views, and if all were to concur in the same view, that concurrence would never constitute a dogma. Melchior Canus (loc. theol. lib. vii. c. 3, p. 425) observes: "Sanctorum auctoritas, sive paucorum, sive plurium, cum ad eas facultates affertur, quæ naturali lumine continentur, certa argumenta non suppeditat: sed tantum pollet, quantum ratio naturæ consentanea persuaserit." P. 432, he continues: "Omnium etiam sanctorum auctoritas in eo genere quæstionum, quas ad fidem diximus minime pertinere, fidem quidem probabilem facit: certam non facit." Canus here means, as is clear from the developement of his proposition, inquiries which have reference to doctrines of faith. At page 430, he subjoins: "Auctores *canonici*, ut superni, cœlestes, divini perpetuam stabilemque constantiam servant, reliqui vero scriptores sancti inferiores et humani sunt, deficiuntque interdum ac monstrum quandoque pariunt, præter convenientem ordinem institutumque naturæ."

subjects, they lay before us their own peculiar views and speculations. From this point of view, where they do not speak, *but through them the belief of the universal Church is made known*, they possess, undoubtedly, a decisive authority:—an authority, however, which belongs not to their persons, but to the tradition, whereby they themselves were regulated, and which they only reflect. In this respect, we must needs agree with them, because one doctrine of faith hath subsisted, and must subsist, through the whole history of the Church. We will not and cannot believe otherwise, than as our fathers have believed; but as to their peculiarities of opinion, we may adopt them or not, as we please. Besides, the truth, which we possess in common with them, has, as we have already elsewhere had occasion to observe, by means of the splendid intellects, which devoted their undivided energy to its defence, been often more deeply investigated, or contemplated in all its bearings, and viewed in a more general connexion; so that Christian science makes continual progress, and the mysteries of God are ever more clearly unfolded. For, this subjective insight into the doctrines of salvation, eternally immutable in themselves, the fathers of the Church have by no means laid down the standard, nor prescribed any pause in the progress of inquiry.*

* St. Vincent Lerinensis expresses himself on this subject with incomparable beauty and truth. “*Esto spiritualis tabernaculi Beseleel (Exod. xxxi. 2) pretiosas divini dogmatis gemmas exsculpe, fideliter coapta, adorna sapienter, adjice splendorem, gratiam, venustatem. Intelligetur, te exponente, illustrius, quod ante obscurius credebatur. Per te posteritas intellectum gratuletur, quod ante vetustas non intellectum venerabatur. Eadem tamen, quæ didicisti, doce: ut, cum dicas nove, non dicas nova.*” c. xxviii.: “*Sed forsitan dicit aliquis:*

The same principle holds good, with regard to their interpretation of Scripture. Except in the explanation of a very few classical passages, we know not where we shall meet with a general uniformity of Scriptural interpretation among the fathers, further than that all deduce from the sacred writings, the same doctrines of faith and morality, yet each in his own peculiar manner; so that some remain for all times distinguished models of Scriptural exposition, others rise not above mediocrity, while others again are, merely by their good

nullusne ergo in ecclesiâ Christi profectus? Habeatur plane et maximus. Nam quis ille est tam invidus hominibus, tam exosus Deo, qui illud prohibere conetur? *Sed ita tamen, ut vere profectus sit ille fidei, non permutatio. Siquidem ad profectum pertinet, ut in semet ipsâ unaquæque res amplificetur, ad permutationem vero, ut aliquid ex alio in aliud transvertatur. Crescat igitur oportet, et multum vehementerque proficiat tam singulorum, quam omnium, tam unius hominis, quam totius ecclesiæ ætatum ac sæculorum gradibus intelligentia, scientia, sapientia; sed in suo duntaxat genere, in eodem scilicet dogmate, eodem sensû, eademque sententiâ.*" c. xxix.: "Imitetur animarum religio rationem corporum; quæ licet annorum processû numeros suos evolvant, et explicent, eadem tamen, quæ erant, permanent. Multum interest inter pueritiæ florem et senectutis maturitatem; sed iidem tamen ipsi fiunt senes, qui fuerant adolescentes; ut quamvis unius ejusdem hominis status habitusque mutetur, una tamen nihilominus, eademque natura, una eademque persona sit," etc. Commonitorium, ed. Klüpfel, Vienn. 1809, c. xxvii. p. 199: "This explanation of St. Vincent was occasioned by the Manicheans, who, as we gather from St. Augustine's works, *De utilitate credendi, De verâ religione, Contra Faustum, &c.*, brought up the old Gnostic charge against Catholics, that they were under a religious tyranny, that among them was found no independent inquiry into doctrine, and no progress in knowledge. How desirable it were, that we could every where find such clear notions of the progressive developement of Christian dogmas, as are here advanced by Vincentius! Now we think we have made a *progress in Christian knowledge*, when we deny Christ to be what he declared himself to be!"

intentions and their love for the Saviour, entitled to veneration. As in this manner, among the fathers themselves, one is superior to the other, and by his exegetical tact, by the acuteness and delicacy of his perceptions, by an intellectual affinity with the writer expounded, by the extent of the philological and historical knowledge brought to the task of interpretation, holds a higher place ; so this may and will be the case in all ages. The same dogmas, the same morality, all like the fathers, will find in Holy Writ ; yet in another way : we will bring forward the same things, but often not in the same manner. More extensive philological acquirements, and the more abundant aids of every kind, which modern times furnish, enable us, without in the least degree deviating from the unanimous interpretation of the fathers, to explain many things in a better and more solid manner than they did.* The better Catholic

* Cardinal Cajetan, in the Preface to his Exposition of Genesis, says : “ Non alligavit Deus expositionem scripturarum sacrarum priscorum doctorum sensibus ; sed Scripturæ ipsi integræ, sub Catholicæ ecclesiæ censurâ ; alioquin spes nobis et posteris tolleretur exponendi scripturam sacram, nisi transferendo, ut aiunt, de libro in quinternum.” The meaning of the cardinal is, that, by a general interpretation of Holy Writ no tenet can be elicited contrary to Catholic doctrine, to the sense of the Church, to the faith unanimously attested by the fathers ; although in details the interpretation may differ from that of the fathers. When, for example, it is said of God, He hardened the heart of Pharaoh, He will raise up false prophets, He hated Esau and loved Jacob before they were born ; so no Catholic exegist, like Calvin and Beza, would thence infer, that the Bible represents God as the author of evil, and would say the Deity creates a portion of mankind for sin, in order to be afterwards able to damn them ; for such a monstrous assertion would be contrary to the universal testimony of the fathers ; that is to say, to the constant doctrine of the Church. On the other hand, the Catholic interpreter may, in his peculiar mode of explaining those passages by the biblical phraseology, differ, if there

exegists since the reformation, from Thomas de Vio, Contareni, Sadoletus, Masius, Maldonado, Justinian,

be adequate grounds, from all the fathers put together. Melchior Canus was not quite satisfied with the above-mentioned principle, because he deduced from it those fanciful opinions, which are not unfrequently met with in Cajetan's exegetical writings: for what Canus, in the work already cited, says, p. 437, is perfectly true: "Illud breviter dici potest, Cajetanum summis ecclesiæ ædicatoribus parem esse potuisse, nisi.....ingenii dexteritate confisus literas demum sacras suo arbitratû exposuisset, felicissime quidem fere, sed in paucis quibusdam locis acutius sane multo, quam felicius."

Pallavacini, on the other hand (in his Hist. Concil. Trident. lib. vi. c. 18, n. 2, p. 221), takes Cajetan under his protection, and shows that he has not acted contrary to the Council of Trent; that rather Melchior Canus required from every writer among the Dominicans, an exclusive adoption of the maxims of that Order, to which he himself belonged. "Equidem in primis affirmo," says Pallavicini, "Cajetanum, quamvis a suis (Cajetan was also a Dominican) in hoc dicto licentiæ notâ reprehensum, nunquam protulisse sensa Tridentino decreto in hac parte adversantia. Secundo, concilium neque præscripsisse, neque coarctasse novis legibus rationem intelligendi Dei verbum; *sed declarasse illicitum et hæreticum quod suapte natura erat* hujusmodi, et prout semper habitum ac declaratum fuerat a patribus, a pontificibus, a conciliis.....Prohibet quidem concilium, ne sacris literis aptetur interpretatio repugnans SS. patrum sententiæ, idque in rebus tum fidei, tum morum; et Cajetanus, utut rem Canus intelligat, de his minime loquitur, neque unquam declarat, fas esse adversus communes SS. patrum sententias obviam ire, sed fas esse depromere scripturæ expositionem prorsus novam, et ab omnibus eorum expositionibus diversam. Etenim quemadmodum ipsi discreparunt inter se in illius explicatione sententiæ, adeoque singulæ eorum explanationes per se ipsas dubitationi subjacent, ita, quantum conjicio, visum est Cajetano, posse cunctas simul dubitationi subjacere et quamdam aliam esse veram, quæ ipsis haud in mentem venerit." Canus himself, however, says p. 457: "Spes inquirunt, nobis et posteris tollitur, exponendi sacras literas nisi transferendo de libro in quinternum. Minime vero gentium. Nam, ut illud præteream, quod in sacris bibliis loci sunt multi, atque adeo libri integri, in quibus interpretum diligentiam ecclesia desiderat, in quibusque proinde juniores possent et eruditionis et ingenii posteris

Estius, Cornelius à Lapide, down to our own days, furnish a proof of what is here asserted ; and the Biblical researches of several critics, such as Richard Simon, Hug, Jahn, Feilmoser, and others, will certainly not show, that the earlier theologians have left nothing to the later ones, but to edit their works anew. Accordingly, wherein consists the impropriety that we should still revere in the Holy Scriptures, the same miracles of divine wisdom and compassion, which our fathers revered fourteen and eighteen hundred years ago ? Doth the impropriety lie in the short-sightedness of our understanding, which is unable to discover, that such simple writings as the Sacred Books, should not have been understood as to their essential import in the times wherein they were published, and in the communities to which they were addressed ? Must we thus look for this impropriety, in our inability to conceive how an age, which was nearest to the composition of the Bible, should have been the furthest removed from the true understanding thereof ? Or, doth it consist in our regarding the opinion as singular, that the Christian Church had not penetrated into the sense of her own sacred records at a time, when she exerted a truly renovating influence over the world, when she conquered Judaism, destroyed Heathenism, and overcame all the powers of darkness ? Or, that we should not be able to convince ourselves, that the night is dispersed by darkness, and illusions by error ? Or, doth the impropriety consist in the opinion, that Holy Writ could not possibly

ipsi quoque suis monimenta relinquere, in illis etiam, quæ antiquorum sunt ingenio ac diligentia elaborata, nonnihil nos christiano populo, si volumus, præstare et quidem utilissime possumus. Possumus enim vetustis novitatem dare, obsoletis nitorem, obscuris lucem, fastiditis gratiam, dubiis fidem, omnibus naturam suam et naturæ suæ omnia."

have been destined in the course of every fifteen years, and even under the hand of each of its expositors, to receive, as if by a divine miracle, an essentially different import than in former times.

Lastly (and this is the principal point), since the Catholic Church regards herself as that institution of the Lord, wherein His doctrines of salvation and the knowledge of the same, have, by the immediate instruction of the apostles, and the power of the Divine Spirit, been deposited ; her claim to interpret, according to her rule of faith, the sacred writings, in which the same doctrines of salvation, under the guidance of the same Spirit, have been laid down, perfectly agrees with the claims of a genuine historical and grammatical exegesis ; and it is precisely the most successful interpretation of this kind, that would, of necessity, most faithfully reflect her doctrines. From her point of view, it appears accordingly quite unintelligible, how her claim should not be consistent with the laws of a true exegesis, alone deserving of the name ; or, how she, in other respects able interpreter, when supported by her rule, should not be precisely the most distinguished. The Protestants, on the other hand, starting from the prejudice, that the peculiar doctrines of the Catholic Church are not conformable to Scripture, must consequently regard her principle of interpretation as one outwardly imposed, and therefore arbitrary and unnatural ; but this prejudice the Catholic repels as idle, and totally devoid of foundation.

§ XLIII.—The Hierarchy.

It now remains for us to make a few remarks on the Hierarchy. The primary view of the Church, as a

divine and human institution, is here evinced in a very striking form. Accordingly, for the exercise of public functions in the Church, for the discharge of the office of teaching, and the administration of the sacraments, a divine internal calling and a higher qualification are, above all things, required. But, as the divine, invisible nature of the Church is connected with a human, visible form; so the calling from above must necessarily be here below first discerned, and then acknowledged; and the heavenly qualification must appear attached to an act obvious to the senses, and executed in the visible Church. Or in other words, the authorization for the public exercise of ecclesiastical functions is imparted by a sacrament—an outward act to be performed by men according to the commission of Christ, and which partly denotes, partly conveys an inward and divine grace.* The introduction into an invisible Church, requires only a spiritual baptism: the continuance in the same, needs only an internal nourishment, we cannot say with the body of Christ (because “body” already reminds us of an *outward* origin of the Church), but with the logos of God. An invisible Church needs only an inward purely spiritual sacrifice, and a general priesthood.† But it is otherwise with a visible church.

* Concil. Trident. Sess. xxiii. cap. 3. “Cum Scripturæ testimonio, Apostolicâ traditione, et patrum unanimi consensû perspicuum sit, per sacram ordinationem, quæ verbis et signis exterioribus perficitur, gratiam conferri; dubitare nemo debet, ordinem esse vere et proprie unum ex septem Sanctæ Ecclesiæ Sacramentis; inquit enim Apostolus: Admoneo te, ut resuscites gratiam, quæ est in te, per impositionem manuum mearum.”

† It is admirably observed by the Council of Trent, cap. i. lib. 1: “Sacrificium et sacerdotium ita Dei ordinatione conjuncta sunt, ut utrumque in omni lege extiterit. Cum igitur in novo testamento

This requires that the baptism of fire, and of the Spirit, should be likewise a baptism of water; and that the nurture of the soul, which Christ imparts, should be visibly represented by a bodily food. In the very idea of such a Church, an external sacrifice, also, is necessarily involved. The same observation will apply to priestly orders: the internal and outward consecration go together; the heavenly and the earthly unction become one and the same. As the preservation of the doctrines and institutions of Christ, hath been intrusted to the Church, so it is impossible for her to revere as a priest, every individual who declares he hath been inwardly consecrated to the priesthood. On the contrary, as he must previously be carefully and strictly bred up, and instructed in the divine dogmas of the Church, in order to contribute towards their further propagation; so he receives through the Church, through her external consecration, the inward consecration from God; or, in other words, he receives, through the imposition of the hands of *the bishops*, the Holy Ghost. The visibility and the stability of the Church, connected therewith, require, accordingly, an ecclesiastical ordination, originating with Christ the fountain-head, and perpetuated in uninterrupted suc-

sanctum Eucharistiæ sacrificium visibile ex Domini institutione Catholica ecclesia acceperit; fateri etiam oportet, in eâ novum esse visibile et externum sacerdotium, in quod vetus translatum est. Hoc autem ab eodem domino Salvatore nostro institutum esse, atque Apostolis, eorumque successoribus in sacerdotio potestatem traditam consecrandi, offerendi et ministrandi corpus et sanguinem ejus, nec non et peccata dimittendi et retinendi, sacræ literæ ostendunt, et Ecclesiæ Catholicæ traditio semper docuit." Hence, in an invisible Church only the invisible forgiveness of sins and confession before God are necessary; but it is otherwise in the visible Church.

cession ; so that as the apostles were sent forth by the Saviour, they, in their turn, instituted bishops, and these appointed their successors, and so on, down to our own days. By this episcopal succession, beginning from our Saviour, and continued on without interruption, we can especially recognize, as by an outward mark, which is the true Church founded by him.†

The episcopacy, the continuation of the apostleship, is accordingly revered as a Divine institution : not less so, and even, on that very account, the Pope, who is the centre of unity, and the head of the episcopacy. If the episcopacy is to form a corporation, outwardly as well as inwardly bound together, in order to unite all believers into one harmonious life, which the Catholic Church so urgently requires, it stands in need of a centre, whereby all may be held together and firmly connected. What a helpless, shapeless mass,

* Irenæus says to the heretics of his time (*Adv. hæres. lib. iii. c. 3*) : “*Hæc ordinatione et successione, ea quæ est ab apostolis in ecclesia traditio et veritatis præconizatio pervenit usque ad nos. Et est plenissima hæc ostensio unam et eandem vivificatricem fidem esse, quæ in ecclesia ab apostolis usque nunc sit conservata et tradita in veritate.*” *Lib. iv. c. 43.* “*Quapropter eis, qui in ecclesiâ sunt presbyteris obaudire oportet, his qui successionem habent ab apostolis, qui cum episcopatûs successione charisma veritatis certum secundum placitum patris acceperunt.*” Tertullian remarks against the same heretics : “*Edant ergo originem ecclesiarum suarum : evolvant ordinem episcoporum suorum ita per successiones ab initio decurrentem, ut primus ille episcopus aliquem ex apostolis, vel apostolicis viris, qui tamen cum apostolis perseveraverint, habuerit auctorem et antecessorem.....Hoc enim modo ecclesiæ apostolicæ census suos deferunt. Sicut Smyrnæorum ecclesia habens Polycarpum ab Johanne conlocatum refert : sicut Romanorum Clementem a Petro ordinatum edit ; proinde utique et cæteræ exhibent. Configant tale aliquid hæretici.*”

† The Council of Florence gives the following definition of the Papal power :—“*Item definimus, sanctam apostolicam sedem et Ro-*

incapable of all combined action, would the Catholic Church not have been, spread as she is over all the kingdoms of the earth, over all parts of the world, had she been possessed of no head, no supreme bishop, revered by all. She would, of necessity, have been split into an incalculable number of particular churches, devoid of all consistency, had not a strong, mighty bond, united all, had not the successor of Peter firmly held them together. Had not the universal Church possessed a head instituted by Christ, and had not this head, *by acknowledged rights and obligations*, been enabled to exert an influence over each of its parts; those parts, abandoned to themselves, would soon have taken a course of developement, contrary to each other, and absolutely determined by local relations, a course which would have led to the dissolution of the whole body. No one can be so weak-minded as not to perceive, that then the whole authority of the Church, in matters of faith, would have vanished, since the several Churches opposed to each other could not attest one and the same thing, nay, must stand in mutual contradiction. Without a visible head, the whole view, which the Catholic Church takes of herself, as a visible society representing the place of Christ, would have been lost, or rather, never would have occurred to her. In a visible Church, a visible head is necessarily in-

manum pontificem in universum orbem tenere primatum, et ipsum Pontificem Romanum successorem esse beati Petri principis Apostolorum, et verum Christi vicarium, totiusque ecclesiæ caput, et omnium Christianorum patrem et doctorem existere; et ipsi in beato Petro pascendi, regendi, et gubernandi universalem ecclesiam a domino nostro Jesu Christo plenam potestatem traditam esse, quemadmodum etiam in gestis œcumenicorum conciliorum et in sacris canonibus continetur." See Hardouin *Acta Concil.* tom. ix. p. 423.

cluded. The following instances may serve to evince, more clearly, the truth of what is here asserted. If, in the appointment of bishops to their particular districts, the universal Church exerted no decisive influence; did not possess, for example, the right of confirmation, then views inimical to the interests of the Church, would infallibly raise to the episcopal dignity men, who, in a short time, would venture to destroy, or, at least, permit the destruction, of the common faith. The same would be the result, if the universal Church did not enjoy the right of deprivation, in case the pastor of a particular Church did not fulfil his essential duties, or even acted in open violation of them. But, what could the universal Church accomplish without her organ, or the organ itself, if no one were bound to obey it? Yet it is, of course, to be understood, that the rights of the head of the Church are restricted to purely ecclesiastical concerns; and if, in the course of the Middle Age, this were otherwise, the causes of this occurrence are to be sought for, in the peculiar circumstances and necessities of that period. With the visibility of the Church—with the visible, regular, and established reciprocal intercourse of the faithful; with the internal necessity of their very existence to be members of one body, a visible head, with essential and inalienable rights, was, accordingly, ordained. In addition to his essential ecclesiastical rights, whose limits may be found traced out in the canonists, the Pope, according to the different degrees of civilization in particular ages, and among particular nations, acquired the so-called non-essential rights, admitting of various changes, so that his power appears sometimes more extended, sometimes more contracted. Moreover, it is well-known, that, partly in consequence of the revolutions of time and of disorders

in the Church, partly through the internal developement of opposite ideas, two systems became prevalent, the episcopal and the papal system; the latter whereof, without questioning the divine institution of bishops, exalted more particularly the central power ; while the former, without denying the divine establishment of the Primacy, sought to draw authority more particularly towards the circumference.* As each system acknowledged the essence of the other to be divine, they constituted an opposition very beneficial to ecclesiastical life; so that, by their counteraction, the peculiar free developement of the several parts was, on one hand, preserved, and the union of these in one living, undivisible whole, was, on the other, maintained.

The dogmatic decrees of the episcopacy (united with the general head and centre), are infallible; for, it represents the universal Church, and one doctrine of faith, falsely explained by it, would render the whole a prey to error. Hence, as the institution which Christ hath established for the preservation and the explanation of His doctrines, is subject, in this its function, to no error;

* The most general maxims of the episcopal system are comprised in the Synods of Constance (1414), and of Basil (1431); they assert, the Pope is *subject* to a general Council lawfully convoked, representing the Church militant :—a one-sided principle, which, when carried out to its legitimate consequences, threatened the Church with annihilation. This coarse opinion may now be considered as obsolete. Concil Const. Sess. iv. in Hardouin, lib. l. tom. viii. p. 252. “*Ipsa Synodus in Spiritu Sancto congregata legitime generale Concilium faciens, ecclesiam Catholicam militantem representans, potestatem à Christo immediate habet, cui quilibet cujuscunque statûs vel dignitatis, etiamsi papalis existat, obedire tenetur in his quæ pertinent ad fidem et extirpationem dicti schismatis, et reformationem generalem ecclesiæ Dei in capite et in membris.*” In the fifth Session this is repeated, and the like is added. The Council of Basil, also, in its second Session, hath adopted both decrees verbally. See Hardouin, lib. l. p. 1121.

so the organ, through which the Church speaks, is also exempt from error.

The Metropolitans (archbishops), and patriarchs, are not, in themselves, essential intermediate grades between the Bishops and the Pope; yet has their jurisdiction, the limits whereof have been determined by general councils, proved very useful for maintaining a closer connexion, and a more immediate superintendence over the bishops, subject to their authority.

The priests, (taking the word in a more limited sense), are, as it were, a multiplication of the bishop; and, as they acknowledge themselves his assistants, they revere in him the visible fountain of their jurisdiction—their head and their centre. In this way, the whole body is bound and jointed together in a living organism: and as the tree, the deeper and wider it striketh its roots into the earth, the more goodly a summit of intertwining boughs and branches it beareth aloft unto the sky, it is so with the congregation of the Lord. For, the more closely the community of believers is established with him, and is enrooted in him, as the all-fruitful soil; the more vigorous and imposing is its outward manifestation.

As to the remaining non-sacerdotal orders, the deacons were instituted by the apostles, and, as their representatives, were charged more immediately with affairs of administration, not immediately connected with the apostolic calling. The sub-deaconship, and the four so-called minor orders, are restricted to a circle of subordinate, yet indispensable ministrations, and in former times, formed altogether (including the deaconship), a practical school, wherein the training for higher ecclesiastical functions was acquired, and a test of qualification for their discharge was afforded. For,

in the ancient Church, the pastors as well as believers, were formed in, and by the immediate experience of life; as the inferior ministers constantly surrounded the bishop or priest, and attending him in all his sacred functions, imbibed the spirit which animated him, and qualified themselves to become one day his successors. But, they rose only slowly and by degrees; and every new ordination, was but the recompense of services faithfully performed, and a period of probation for a still more important trust. At present, these orders, from the sub-deaconship downwards, are preserved but as ancient customs; for, the educational system of modern times, bears an essentially different character, and follows a decidedly theoretical course. Hence, the duties, which the inferior members of the clergy once performed, are now nearly everywhere discharged by laymen, such as acolytes, sacristans, and the like.

LUTHERAN DOCTRINE ON THE CHURCH.

§ XLIV.—The Bible the only source and arbitress in matters of faith.

Great importance has been attached by us to the proposition, that a positive religion, if destined to act with a permanent and decisive authority on mankind, must be ever imparted to successive generations, through the medium of an authority. In the application of this trust, however, an illusion may easily occur. Thus we may imagine that the ordinary mode, in which an historical fact is attested, may here absolutely suffice; and that thus, if credible eye and ear-witnesses have delivered a written testimony, respecting the divine

envoy, their evidence should constitute an adequate and lasting authority for all times. In the same way, as Polybius and Livy are our sources of information, in respect to the second Punic war, and Herodian in regard to the heroic deeds of the emperor Commodus, so Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, are the standing authority for those who desire to know Christ, to surrender to him their faith ; and thus the necessary claim, that the authority of Christ should be represented by an authority, is fully satisfied.

But here, several extremely important circumstances are completely overlooked. The sacred historians the Christian, in fact, by no means ranks in the same class with other writers of history, nor, on that account, the readers of the Bible with those of any other historical work. We hold it to be necessary, that, under quite special conditions, the evangelical historians should have written down their narratives, in order not to be disturbed by the doubt, whether they had in reality rightly heard, seen, and understood. *For this very reason*, from the foundation of Christianity, it has been deemed a matter of necessity, that only under certain peculiar conditions could the right understanding of the sacred penmen be secured, in order that we might have the decided conviction, that what they recorded, without falsification, we apprehended, without confusion. As little, nay, from evident reasons still less, can we trust alone to the honest purpose and personal capacity of the author of the apostolic epistles, when the question at issue is, whether, in the application and further developement of what they had learned from and respecting Jesus, they have not erred ; but precisely, because we do not wish, and cannot wish to bestow such confidence, we are unable to rest satisfied with those ordinary means, which

are employed to discover the sense of an author. And this, because here far other wants are to be satisfied than those, which the study of a Greek or Roman classic can gratify; because matters of far graver moment, and unquestionably weightier influence on life, are involved, than in the case of the latter; to wit, the knowledge whereon depends the salvation of immortal souls.

The following circumstance, also, was overlooked, the non-observance whereof was likely to entail important consequences. We have two sources from which we derive our knowledge of God and divine things,—the natural and the supernatural revelation: for brevity-sake we will put a part for the whole, and say,—the revelation of God within us, and the revelation of God out of us in Christ Jesus. The revelation of God within us, is likewise the organ, whereby we apprehend the outward revelation; and it has, therefore, a twofold function, at once to bear testimony unto God, and our relation towards Him, and also to receive the testimony coming from without. Accordingly, in behalf of one and the same object, we directed to two witnesses, quite distinct one from the other; and the matter of importance is, that the one witness within us should not overvalue the worth of his evidence, and willingly confess that his declarations stand in a subordinate relation to those of the other; for, otherwise, the necessity of another witness, beside him, would be inexplicable. Precisely as historical criticism decides on the qualities of the witnesses, and seeks to discover, in each particular case, whether they could rightly *apprehend*, and desired faithfully *to recount* what they had learned, so must the witness in our own interior be examined. But, this inward witness possesses a very

decided advantage, over the outward one. *Being the organ for the latter*, he is too inclined, in his narrative, to substitute his own pretended internal perceptions, for the testimony of the voucher, who stands by his side ; and persuades himself that he is but faithfully relating what he had learned from without, when he has been listening only to himself, and in this wise has thrown every thing into confusion.

For this simple reason it is evident, that the attestation of the purport of an external revelation can, by no means, be unconditionally ranked, with the attestation of any other fact ; nor, can it be affirmed, that the written testimony of credible eye and ear-witnesses, is an adequate authority in the one case, as it is in the other. What any informant relates, respecting the events of ordinary life, we can learn only from the testimony of him and his like. That Carthage was taken by Scipio Æmilianus, is known to us only from the ancient historians ; and as our own interior suggests not the slightest hint, as to such a fact, there is no danger of confounding here our internal voice, with the narrative of the historian. Religious truths, on the other hand, are attested in a twofold manner ; and there is an imminent danger that what hath been revealed to us from without, while we are but bringing it home to our own conviction, might take the colour of our minds, and undergo a greater or less change. Hence, beside Holy Writ, which objectively is unerring, the living authority of the Church has been instituted, in order that we might obtain *for ourselves*, subjectively, the divine word, as it is *in itself*. Between *two persons*, moreover, an absolute understanding alone is possible ; between a person and a writing, on the other hand, an absolute misunderstanding is but too possible.

Had we no innate, internal testimony of God, so that we were by nature utterly godless; then indeed, provided only we had still the faculty of apprehending him, a mere book would have availed as sufficient authority. In that case, at least, our own interior, perhaps delusive, testimony could not possibly have been confounded, with the outward one; still less, could a tacit preference have been given to the former, if not the slightest tone of a divine voice came forth from our bosoms. No fear then could have been entertained, that we were listening *to ourselves*, instead of to God, when all in man that could point to heaven, were mute. This is the point, where Luther's doctrine, on Scripture and the Church, coincides with his other errors, that have been previously investigated. His doctrine touching original sin inculcated, that nothing in man intimated and attested the Deity: His doctrine on the absence of human free-will, and the exclusive operation of God in the work of salvation, that the Divine Spirit *alone* engenders faith in man. So next the proposition was advanced, that Holy Writ is the sole fountain-head, standard, and judge in matters of faith.* While, therefore, the Catholic Church, in order to guard man against errors, in the reception of Christian truth, and to afford him the certainty that he is in possession of the same, presents herself as the all-sufficient, because divinely appointed, surety; Luther, on the other hand, seeks to obtain the same end, by not only exalting the measure of the communications of the Holy Spirit, but

* Epitome Comp. §. p. 543. "Credimus, confitemur, et docemus, unicam regulam et normam, ex quâ omnia dogmata, omnesque doctores judicare oporteat, nullam omnino aliam esse, quam prophetica et apostolica, tum veteris, tum novi Testamenti Scripta." Solid. declar. forma dijudic. contro. § ii. p. 605.

by annihilating all human concurrence, and reserving to the Deity an exclusive agency : he says, the Holy Spirit readeth in the Scriptures, not thou.

As accordingly the Reformers represented all human concurrence in the work of salvation, not only as unnecessary, but as impossible, and held that, where human eagerness ventured an intrusion into this work, an abortion was unavoidably engendered ; so, they indulged in the idea, that whoever addressed himself immediately to Holy Writ, obtained an immediate knowledge of its contents. They rejected the mediating authority of the Church, which guided the intellectual activity of each individual, because they wished to avoid *every* thing human, without apprehending that the subjectivity of the believer, would, thereby, be set in the most unrestrained movement, and be confounded with the objective revelation ; nay, without fearing, that any human alloy were possible in this work, because such had been discarded from their own imagination.

This view often breaks out with singular naïveté ; as for instance, in the oft-repeated assertion, that the Bible is the judge in matters of faith. The reader of the Scripture is, unhesitatingly, confounded with the Scripture itself, and the immediate conveyance of its contents to his mind, most childishly assumed. It is one thing to say, “the Bible is the source of the doctrine of salvation ;” and another to say, “it is the judge to determine what is the doctrine of salvation.” The latter it can as little be, as the code of civil law can exercise the functions of the judge : it forms indeed the rule of judgment, but it doth not itself pronounce judgment. But, as Luther originally quite overlooked the concurrence of human energies, and held all his

thoughts, judgments, and conclusions, in regard to the kingdom of God, to be as much the effects of an exclusive divine operation, as his will in reference to the kingdom of God; so all conceptions of Scripture, and of the readers of Scripture, floated indiscriminately in his mind; and the proposition was then advanced, that the Bible is the judge in controversies of faith.* In numerous passages of the writings of the Reformers, as, for example, in the following sentence of Zuinglius, this confusion recurs. In wishing to explain what Church cannot err, and how it cometh that it cannot err, he says, "The sheep of God follow the word of God alone, which can in nowise deceive: it is accordingly clear, which is the inerrable Church, the one, to wit, which rests on the word of God alone."† In other words, he who holds to the infallible Word of God alone, is regarded, in the most unqualified manner, as infallible; just as if it were one and the same to read the inerrable Scripture, and to be forthwith inerrable: and, as if a vastly important intermediate step were not here over-leaped. On the other hand, the Reformers concluded,

* We know indeed that the opinion, the Bible is the judge in doctrinal disputes, is made to signify as much, that the Bible best explains itself; that thus the context, parallel passages, &c. remove obscurities, and allay controversies. But, this is far from completely meeting the view of the first Reformers, and abstractedly considered, is historically quite false.

† Zuingl. de verâ et fals. relig. comment. Opp. tom. ii. fol. 192. "Hæc tandem sola est ecclesia labi et errare nescia, quæ solam Dei pastoris vocem audit, nam hæc sola ex Deo est. Qui enim ex Deo est, verbum Dei audit; et rursus, vos non auditis, qui ex Deo non estis. Ergo qui audiunt, Dei oves sunt, Dei ecclesia sunt, errare nequeunt: nam solum Dei verbum sequuntur, quod fallere nullâ ratione potest. Habes jam, quænam sit ecclesia, quæ errare nequeat, ea nimirum sola, quæ solo Dei verbo nititur."

that Catholics are in error, because they interpret Holy Writ, according to the authority of the Church.

That the union which we have pointed out between the mode, wherein, according to the Reformers, man, in his inward sentiments and his powers of will, is converted to God, and the mode, wherein the religious thoughts and conceptions of the believer are formed, is based on no arbitrary assumption, may be irrefragably proved by numerous passages, from Luther and Zuinglius, when, even the general connexion of their doctrines did not clearly imply it. In his writings to the Bohemians, on the institution of Church ministers,* Luther expressly declares, that the believer is the freest judge of all his teachers, *since he is inwardly instructed by God alone*. Excellently well doth Zuinglius illustrate the sense of his colleague in Wittenberg; and we may the more confidently summon him, as a witness to Luther's original view, as he nowhere manifests a productive genius, has not, perhaps, in all his writings, expressed one original, pregnant idea, and almost always pushes Luther's opinions to an extreme, albeit, he often ridiculously puts in claims to originality. Zuinglius compares, without scruple, the word of Scripture to the Word of God, whereby all things were created out of nothing—with that word, in virtue whereof light arose when the Lord spake: "Let there be light."† To explain the mode of operation of the

* Luther de instit. minist. eccles. Opp. tom. ii. fol. 584. "His et similibus multis locis, tum evangelii, tum totius Scripturæ, quibus admonemur, ne falsis doctoribus credamus, quid aliud docemur, quam ut nostræ propriæ quisquis pro se salutis rationem habens, certus sit, quid credat et sequatur, ac judex liberrimus sit omnium, qui docent eum, *intus à Deo solo doctus*." Other passages we shall cite below.

† Zuingl. de certitud. et clarit. verbi Dei. c. 11. Opp. tom. i. fol.

Divine Word, he appeals, moreover, to that internal word, which came to the prophets of the old covenant, and which, although it exacted what was most extraordinary, and promised what was most marvellous, *yet without the aid of human reflection and mental activity*, took possession of those to whom it was addressed, and brought them under subjection.* Mingling truth with falsehood, and deducing the latter from the former, he concludes that no man can instruct another, since Christ saith, “No one cometh to Him, unless the Father draw him.” That no man can implant faith in another—that, without the internal attraction of the Father, without the mysterious opening of the internal sense by the Holy Spirit, no one can believe, is undoubtedly quite certain. But the opinion, that on this account, human co-operation is unnecessary, rests on the very same false conclusion, which the Reformers drew, when they represented the conversion of the will, as the exclusive work of God.†

165. “Tanta verbi Dei certitudo et veritas, tanta etiam ejusdem virtus et potentia, ut quæcunque velit mox juxta nutum illius eveniant. Dixit et facta mandavit et creata sunt . . . Dixit Deus, fiat lux, et facta est lux. Ecce quanta sit Verbi virtus,” etc.

* Loc. cit. c. 111. p. 168. seq.

† Loc. cit. p. 169. “Cum Deo docente discant pii, cur non eam doctrinam; quam divinitus accipiunt, iis liberam permittitis? Quod vero Deus piorum animos instituat, Christus eodem in loco non obscure innuit, dicens: omnis qui audiverit à patre et didicerit, ad me venit. Nemo ad Christum pervenit, nisi cognitionem illius à patre acceperit. Jamne ergo videtis et auditis, quis sit magister fidelium? Non patres, non doctores titulo superbi, non magistri nostri, non pontificum cœtus, non sedes, non scholæ nec concilia, sed pater Domini nostri Jesu Christi. Quid ergo, objicitis, an homo hominem docere non potest? Nequaquam. Christus enim dicit: nemo venit ad me, nisi pater traxerit eum . . . Verba spiritus clara sunt, doctrina Dei clara est, docet et hominis animum sine ullo humanæ rationis addita-

Here, moreover, we can clearly discern the cause, why the Reformers were originally such decided adversaries to all philosophy and speculation — why Carlstadt, who was a confederate of Luther's, in the famous disputation at Leipzig, required the candidates of theology to apply themselves to some handicraft, rather than to study, in order that the human mind might not be filled with things, which only impeded the entrance of the Divine Spirit. Accordingly he himself gave up the scientific investigation of the Scriptures, in order that, from simple artisans, who had not disqualified themselves by indulging in human reflections, he might learn immediately, through God, the mysteries of His kingdom, and be initiated in the true sense of Holy Writ. Melancthon went as an apprentice to a baker, not only to learn how to understand the Bible, but to apply it, when understood in the manner, we have mentioned; for, the passage “by the sweat of thy brow,” &c. he conceived to be a divine precept, imposing the duty of manual labour.

We are, indeed, aware, that Luther himself very much modified this his original view, which, on the part of the Lutherans and Calvinists, had been made to undergo a still greater change. But, when we wish to exhibit to view, the internal genesis of the Protestant theory of the Church, we should not hold up the later phase as the earliest, nor, in general, confound one with

mento, de salute certiozem reddit,” etc. In Zuinglius, the doctrine of absolute predestination, and of the exclusive agency of the Deity, evidently exerted a great influence in the framing of this article; namely, that what man, in the reading of the Bible and so forth, performs by reflection, *he seems* only so to do. Loc. cit. p. 171. “Quod vero hâc in re opus tamen esse credis, non tuum sed Spiritus sancti est, qui occulte in te et per virtutem suam operatur.”

the other. The later conceptions of Luther, which were meant to be an improvement, on his earlier opinions, brought into his system contradictions, which must themselves be accounted for. It was also only outward phenomena, that induced Luther to pursue another course—to wit, the rise of the Anabaptists. As the authors of this sect, like Luther, appealed to the interior teachings of the Divinity, and as he felt utterly incapable of meeting their objections, on this ground, he saw himself forced to insist anew, on the indispensable necessity of human efforts, for the right understanding of Scripture. In general, the fanatical commotions, excited by the so-called heavenly prophets, gave a very different turn to Luther's mind, than he previously had; and this fact, Adolphus Menzel, in his "Modern History of the Germans," has observed with great penetration. But, at all events, those are far from duly appreciating Luther's views and spirit, who imagine, that he absolutely believed that he could discover the true sense of Scripture, by an historico-grammatical interpretation. Nothing was more alien to him—nothing more at variance with his whole system: the very notion that, by human exertions, we can win and appropriate to ourselves the knowledge of divine things, he held to be the acme of ungodliness. Learned interpretation was, by no means, his method for discovering the sense of the Bible, but only for obtaining for himself and others, an exegetical explication of the sense, engendered in man by the immediate and exclusive operation of the Deity—an explication, which, according to his principles, should have appeared quite unnecessary. Zuingli's and Luther's original views, may thus, in a certain sense, be compared with the Catholic doctrine. The Catholic Church saith: "I am imme-

diately certain, wherein the true doctrine of Christ and of the Apostles consists, for, I have been therein instructed, trained up and educated; and what I have learned, hath been, by the Divine Spirit, deeply impressed and confirmed on my heart. The written word of the Apostles can only coincide with their oral communications, and must be interpreted by the same." On the other hand, the opinion of the two Reformers appears to have been this: "God, by his own interior word of power, working with human co-operation, hath implanted his doctrine within us, through the vehicle of the Sacred Scriptures. According to this interior word, whose working forms the Christian consciousness, the outward word must, in its details, be then explained." It is indeed extremely difficult to form a very clear conception of the primitive views of the Reformers: but, we think it vain to attempt to reconcile, in any other manner, the words of Luther, "The believer is internally taught by God alone," with the perpetually recurring assertion, that, without the Bible, no Christian knowledge is possible. In the sequel, we shall obtain fuller explanations on this matter.

§ XLV.—Continuation. Internal ordination. Every Christian a priest and teacher, and consequently independent of all ecclesiastical communion. Notion of ecclesiastical freedom.

These opinions were attended with the weightiest and most decisive consequences. As each believer was deemed to be instructed by God alone, and capable, without human aid, of attaining to Christian knowledge; so, in the first place, an outward Christian ministry could not even be conceived: God, by means of Scripture, was the sole teacher. In the second place, or-

dination, as a sacrament, became no longer necessary ; since this presupposes the necessity of a continuance of the divine work of salvation, by the mediation of the Church. But then, as God communicates himself, with indubitable certainty, only in an immediate and interior manner, it follows, that as no human teacher is any longer necessary ; so an outwardly accredited ministry is equally, and still more unnecessary. The exterior ordination becomes transmuted into a purely internal act, whereby God imparts the consecration of the Spirit, not to this or that individual in a special manner, but to all in an equal degree. In a word, Luther laid hold of the old Christian idea of a universal priesthood, disfigured it, and then applied it to his new scheme. This is a subject to which he often recurs, but, he treats it, at full length, in the Essay to the Bohemian Brethren, which we have already had occasion to cite. We must here briefly state the leading ideas of this essay. Quite in the beginning, and still more in the course of this production, Catholic Ordination is exhibited as a mere daubing, shaving, and jugglery, whereby nought but lying and idle fools, true priests of Satan, were made. One could likewise shave the hair off any sow, and put a dress on any block.* Luther requires his disciples confidently to reject all those, who have been ordained by the beast, as he calls the Pope, that is to say, all those who had received ordination in the Catholic Church, in whose place the Pope is named, as being its representative. No one should doubt, he says, that he is justified, nay, obliged to do this, since all believers have received from Christ a priestly dignity, which not only entitles, but binds them to exercise

* Luther de instituendis minist. eccles. opp. tom. ii. fol. 585.

the office of teaching, to forgive sins, and to administer all the sacraments. *The Holy Spirit, with its interior unction, instructs each one in all things*, engenders faith in him, and makes him assured of its possession.* Although now all be qualified for, and possess the right of exercising the priestly functions, yet, *in order to avoid disorder*, they must delegate to one or more of their body the general right, to be exercised in their place, and in their name, after the more respected members of the community have imposed hands on him, and thereby made him their bishop. (Ordination according to this point of view, is nothing more than a mere act of introduction into an ecclesiastical office.)

Before we proceed in this exposition, we may be permitted to express the thoughts, which the views of

* Loc. cit. fol. 584. "Christianum esse puto eum, qui Spiritum sanctum habet, qui (ut Christus ait) docebit eum omnia. Et Johannes ait: unctio ejus docebit vos omnia, hoc est, ut in summa dicam: Christianus ita certus est, quid credere et non credere debeat, ut etiam pro ipso moriatur, aut saltem mori paratus sit." (What would Luther *now* say?) Fol. 585. "Deinde cum quilibet sit ad verbi ministerium natus e baptismo, etc. Quodsi exemplum petimus, adest Apollo Act. 18, quem legimus plane sine ullâ vocatione et ordinatione Ephesum venisse et ferventer docuisse, Judæosque potenter revicisse.—Aliud exemplum præstant Stephanus et Philippus. . . . Quo jure, rogo, et quâ auctoritate? Certe nusquam nec rogati nec vocati a quopiam, sed proprio motu et generali jure." (What astonishing proofs!) Then: "Nova res est, inquit, et sine exemplo, sic eligere et creare episcopos. Respondeo: Imo antiquissima et exemplis Apostolorum suorumque discipulorum probata, licet per Papistas contrario exemplo et pestilentibus doctrinis abolita et extincta." (Compare the Acts of the Apostles, c. xiv. 22; Titus. c. i. 5. 11 Tim. ii. 2.) Deinde si maxime nova res esset, tamen cum verbum Dei hic luceat et jubeat, simul necessitas animarum cogit, prorsus nihil movere debet rei novitas, sed verbi majestas. Nam quid rogo non est novum, quod fides facit? Non fuit etiam Apostolorum tempore novum hujusmodi ministerium? Non fuit novum, quod filii Israel mare transierunt?" etc.

Luther here stated, have excited in our minds. His writing to the Bohemians, in the true democratic tone of the most disgusting popular adulation, confers on every Christian a degree of perfection, which is belied by the most casual glance, that an impartial spirit will cast into its own interior. That yearning after communion, which is discernible in every man, and by none is felt more vividly than by the Christian, would be utterly inexplicable, if each man, like to a God, knew everything, possessed all truth and all life within himself, and, in every respect, absolutely sufficed for himself. All communion arises and exists but by the sense, or the clear knowledge of our own wants and deficiencies, and the perception thereby determined, that it is only in connexion with, and the closest adherence to others, our own incapacity and helplessness can be removed. From Luther's view of the rights of a Christian, we cannot even conceive, why the latter should at all need a teacher, and wherefore a community, of which each individual member possesses sufficient power, to satisfy all his own wants, should be called on to appoint such a teacher. Even the quite material and paltry motive, which he assigns for the necessity of a public teacher, namely, "the avoidance of disorder," is, in his scheme, devoid of all consistency.

What need is there of a congregation, for mutual edification or mutual instruction, when each individual is taught to consider himself as an independent, all-sufficient monad? Far other principles than these of Luther's, did the Apostle Paul, in his first epistle to the Corinthians, (c. xii.) unfold on the communion of life in the Church, which he finds established in the distribution of the diverse gifts of the one Spirit among many, yet, in their operations necessary for all believers, who,

therefore like the members of one body, are taught to depend one upon the other. If Luther says, "each one is born out of baptism for the ministry," so Paul, on the other hand, saith: "Are *all* apostles, are *all* prophets, are *all* teachers?" Luther considers the Divine Spirit as so distributed among all, that in each individual it is found in all its forms, whereby the very idea of a common organic life is utterly destroyed. Paul, on the other hand, asserts the various revelation of the One in the many, whereby a living connected whole is produced.*

* Melchior Canus (*Loci theologici*, lib. iv. c. 4, p. 238, seq.) has already well answered the objection of the Reformers, that Catholics attributed the entire gifts of the Holy Spirit to the body only, and were unwilling to concede to individuals the full measure of such graces, though they need them all. Canus replies, as the peculiar functions of every member in the physical body tend to the profit of the whole, and each participates in them all, so it is with the moral body of the Church. "Unicuique, ait S. Paulus, nostrum data est gratia secundum mensuram donationis Christi. Et, Ipse dedit quosdam quidem apostolos, etc. ad consummationem sanctorum in opus ministerii, in ædificationem corporis Christi. Et posterius: accrescimus in illo, qui est caput Christus; ex quo totum corpus compactum et connexum secundum operationem, in mensuram uniuscujusque membri, augmentum corporis facit in adificationem sui in charitate." (Eph. c. iv., 11, 16.) Membrum igitur, quoniam id, quod totius corporis est, nihil sibi vindicat proprium: sed ita in corpus omnia confert, ut magis corporis, quam membri actiones perfectionesque esse videantur. Quocirca illud absurdum est, quod ii scilicet, quibuscum nunc disseritur, eam curam, quam debent capere, non capiunt..... Nos sane, quemadmodum scimus, animam actum et perfectionem esse, maxime quidem corporis physici organici, secundo autem loco membrorum etiam singulorum, quibus varias licet edat functiones, sed omnes illæ et corporis proprie sunt, et propter corpus ipsum membris a naturâ tributæ; ita spiritum veritatis ad corpus primum ecclesiæ referimus, deinde propter ecclesiam ad singulas etiam ecclesiæ partes, non ex æquo, sed analogia et proportionem quâdam juxta mensuram

Luther thus considered each individual believer as absolutely independent of a religious community, because standing in need of none, and therefore *ecclesiastically free*. Here we are enabled to explain a phenomenon, the connexion whereof with others was impervious to the understanding of a celebrated historian. Schmidt, in his history of the Germans, deemed it strange, on the part of the Lutherans, that they should reject metaphysical freedom, and yet, on the other hand, lay claim to ecclesiastical liberty. It was precisely, however, the denial of the former, which led to the affirmation of the latter. He who believes himself to be guided by God *only*, cannot possibly discover any meaning in a dependence on men ; nay, he must reject it as absurd—as, on one hand, the offspring of arrogance, ambition, and the love of a besotting domination ; so on the other, as the effect of spiritual blindness, and of a slavish sense, ignorant of Gospel liberty—the liberty of the children of God. The Catholic, on the other hand, who concedes to man the first-named species of freedom, and pretends not to deny his power of independent action, cannot do otherwise than look on himself as bound by the authority of the Church, and for this reason, because every thing human is to be con-

uniuscujusque membri. Unum corpus, inquit, et unus spiritus. Unicuique autem nostrum data est gratia secundum mensuram donationis Christi. Quænam, vero, hæc mensura Christi est ? Secundum operationem, ait, in mensuram uniuscujusque membri. Spiritus ergo suo quidem modo singulis promissus est, ut magnos doceat, doceat et parvulos. Ac parvulis lac potum dat, majoribus solidum cibum. Illis Christam loquitur et hunc crucifixum : his loquitur sapientiam in mysterio absconditam. Verum singulis membris sic spiritus veritatis adest, ut non solum corpori universo non desit, sed corpori quam membris prius potiusque intelligatur adesse, etc.

sidered as established in manifold relations, and determined by the finite world, in which it lives.*

Moreover, in considering the outward relations of things, it is not difficult to conceive how the doctrine we have stated might, nay must, have arisen in the mind of Luther. As he had against him the authority of the existing Church, he was forced to resort to the immediate power of God working within him; as the old ecclesiastical spirit became extinct in his breast, he must begin by renouncing all historical and traditionary guidance, and incapable of calling back in person the Apostles themselves, in order to be authorized by them in the name of Christ, he saw no other expedient than an appeal to an invisible, internal authorization. The consequences were not slow to follow. Scarce had Luther's opinions obtained currency, and begun to be enforced, when men, the most uncalled, deemed themselves to have received the calling of teachers, and universal confusion ensued.†

* Luther de capt. Babyl. p. 288, b. "Christianis nihil nullo jure posse imponi legum, sive ab hominibus, sive ab angelis, nisi quantum volunt, *liberi enim sumus ab omnibus*. Decebat enim nos esse, sicut parvuli baptizati, qui nullis studiis, nullis operibus occupati, in omnia sunt liberi, solius gloriâ baptismi sui securi et salvi. Sumus enim et ipsi parvuli in Christo, assidue baptizati, p. 288, a. Dico itaque: neque papa, neque episcopus, neque ullus hominum habet jus unius syllabæ constituendæ super Christianum hominem, nisi id fiat ejusdem consensû, quidquid aliter fit, tyrannico spiritû fit." Hence, Melancthon, in further proof of this, asserts that, after Christ, no new law, no ordinance and rite *ought* to be instituted. "Loc, p. 6. Ademit igitur potestatem, novas leges, novos ritus condendi."

† The congregations elected such men for their preachers, as spoke in a manner the carnal sense was delighted to hear. It was, by such preachers, that the war of the peasants was, in a great degree, enkindled. George Eberlin, a Lutheran pastor, in the year 1526, dissuaded the peasants from joining in the insurrection, and among other things ob-

The Augsburg Confession sought to obviate this evil, and hence enjoined, that no one should teach in public, who had not received a lawful vocation. An article which, in the Lutheran system, is utterly unintelligible, and to which, therefore, we can assign no place therein; but must merely rest satisfied with stating its existence, as well as the *extraneous* causes, to which it owed its origin. It is, too, a consequence of the *accidental* character of this article, that it merely asserts, that every teacher is to be called in a lawful manner, without at all determining in what this lawfulness consists.* Law-

served: "Should the people say, why had revolt been preached up to them, the answer is, why did they not let their preachers be tested before hand, and without advice suffer every loose fisherman to preach? Compare Bucholz: Geschichte der Regierung Ferd. I. (History of the Reign of Ferdinand I.) Vienna, 1831. vol. ii. p. 220.

* Confess. August. Art. xiv. De ordine ecclesiastico docent, quod nemo debeat in ecclesiâ publice docere, nisi rite vocatus. Moreover, it was necessary not only to pass this ordinance, but to enjoin, that teachers should generally be procured, and be maintained. The Saxon nobility and peasants took Luther at his word; and since he had told them, that, by the interior unction, they were made acquainted with all things; and as men divinely illuminated, they stood in need of no human teachers, they were uncommonly flattered by this declaration, and seriously resolved to do away with the public ministry. Hence, they withheld from the curates their dues. Luther complains somewhere, "That if aid be not speedily brought, the Gospel, schools, and parish ministers, are all ruined in this land; the latter must go, for they possess nothing, and wander about, looking like haggard ghosts." Elsewhere he says: "The people will no longer give anything, and there is such thanklessness among them for the holy Word of God, that, if I could do it with a safe conscience, I should help to deprive them of pastors or preachers, and let them live like swine, as they already do." See Plank's History of the Protestant System of Doctrine. Vol. ii. p. 342. (In German). Had not the sovereign power interfered to set restraints on this gospel liberty, never, according to Luther's principles, could an ecclesiastical community have been formed.

fulness, according to the principles of the Reformers, consisted in this: that nothing external could be lawfully instituted, and that every one might undertake the office of teacher, who believed himself under the impulse of the Divine Spirit, and could find such singular hearers, as, firmly convinced, they already knew every thing, and needed no instruction, yet were, nevertheless, most desirous to learn. That, at a latter period, the Consistories reserved to themselves the right of deciding, on the qualifications of a candidate, for the office of preacher, and permitted the congregation to elect only such, as had enlisted the approval of the most higher functionaries, is a fact as well known, as the utter inconsistency of such an arrangement, with the fundamental doctrines of Luther, must be evident to every mind. At all events, it is a very remarkable fact, that the Lutherans, nay, Luther himself, in his maturer years, should have practically, at least, rejected his fundamental opinions, and thereby unequivocally demonstrated, that, perfectly adapted as those opinions might be, for the destruction of an existing Church, and the subversion of all established notions, yet were they utterly unserviceable, for the building up and consolidation of a new Church. To construct such a Church, they were forced to recur to the old Catholic method, which had been so violently assailed. In the examination of the doctrines of the Anabaptists, we shall first have occasion to furnish the most striking evidences of this retrograde *movement*.

§ XLVI.—Continuation. Invisible Church.

By the analysis we have followed, we have obtained a tolerably complete insight, into the Lutheran theory of the Church. The believer, according to what has been stated, is, in the first place, instructed by God only, exclusively of all co-operation of human activity, whether it be his own, or that of other men. In the second place, he is on this account infallible, because, having been taught by God, without human concurrence, whereby error can alone arise, he is in himself absolutely inerrable. Thirdly, it cannot hence be discerned, why he should need the supplemental aid of a congregation, invested with authority, from whose centre the Word of God should be announced to him ; for, by the assistance of the outward Divine Word, written in the depths of his heart, he hears his voice alone, and without an intermediate organ.*

What, after all this, can the Church be other than an invisible community, since no rational object, in the visibility of the Church, can any longer be conceived ? So, in fact, Luther defines its notion, when he says, “ As we pray in faith, I believe in a Holy Ghost, in a communion of saints. This means the community, or congregation of all those, who live in the right faith, hope and charity ; thus, the essence, life and nature of

* We must here for once observe to our readers, that it is not our fault, if, in the words of the text, a contradiction should be apparent. For, the words, “ God alone without any intermediate organ worketh in man ;” and those, “ He worketh by the aid of the external, divine, and written Word,” involve a contradiction. It is only in the second part of this work, this contradiction will be fully solved.

christendom, consists not in a bodily assemblage, but in the assemblage of hearts in one faith.”* That this one faith will never fail, Luther had not the slightest cause to doubt, for God, whose agency is here represented as exclusive, will everywhere produce the same effects.

But, we have already seen how Luther, although, according to him, believers are inwardly taught by God alone, yet all at once (and without its being possible to discover, in his system, any rational ground for such an assumption), admits the establishment of human teachers, and even the lawfulness of their calling. Hereby the Church becomes visible, recognizable, obvious to the eye, so that the ill-connected notions of God, the sole teacher, and of a human teacher declared competent, and who cannot yet be dispensed with, meet us again in such a way as to imply, that the invisible is still a visible Church also. In Luther’s work against Ambrosius Catharinus, this singular combination of ideas is most decidedly expressed. Luther asks himself the question, which Catharinus had already proposed, “but those will say, if the Church be *quite in the spirit*, and of a nature thoroughly spiritual, how can we discern where on earth any part of it may be?” And he accordingly confesses, that it must be absolutely internal in its nature; only he replies, “the necessary mark, whereby we recognize it, and which we possess,

* Luther “On the Papacy.” Jena. German edition, vol. i. p. 266’ Respons. ad librum Ambros. Cathar. anno 1521. Opp. tom. ii. fol. 376. In the work on the Papacy, Luther says, “Furthermore, because communion with the visible Church constitutes no communion with the invisible, and because many non-Christians are found in the visible Church, so no visible Church is at all necessary !

is baptism and the Lord's Supper, and above all, the Gospel."* Hereby the Church evidently becomes outwardly manifest, and consequently not entirely, and in every respect spiritual. Still better doth the Augsburg Confession describe the Church as a community of saints, in which the Gospel is rightly taught, and the sacraments are duly administered;† so that, in as far as it consists of saints only, it is absolutely invisible; for the saints no one knoweth but God alone; and, inasmuch as the Gospel is there taught, and baptism, and the body of the Lord are therein administered, it cannot avoid being visible. The singularity of the notion, that the Church, which should be only an invisible, because a purely spiritual one, yet must be perceptible to the senses, is still further heightened by the addition, that it is found there, where the Gospel is *rightly* taught, and the sacraments are *rightly* administered. For, this passage supposes that there are false Churches; and now to distinguish the true from the opposite Churches, the right doctrine set forth by the saints, and the right worship administered by them, is given as a sign. Doubtless, the true Church possesses the pure evangelical Word and sacraments, and lives by them, and consequently possesses saints. Yet,

* Luther's Respons. ad libr. Ambros. Cathar. loc. cit. fol. 376-377. Dices autem, si ecclesia tota est in spiritu, et res omnino spiritualis, nemo ergo nosse poterit, ubi sit ulla ejus pars in toto orbe . . . Quo ergo signo agnoscam ecclesiam? Respondeo; signum necessarium est, quod et habemus, Baptisma, ac panem et omnium potissimum Evangelium.

† Confess. August. Art. vii. Item docent, quod una sancta ecclesia perpetuo mansura sit. Est autem ecclesia congregatio sanctorum, in quâ Evangelium recte docetur, et recte administrantur sacramenta. Et ad veram unitatem ecclesiæ satis est, consentire de doctrinâ Evangelii, et administratione sacramentorum.

from all this, the true Church of Christ, amid the struggle of various parties, is not to be recognized. For, either from the circumstance, that a saint, or, in other words, a man qualified by God alone for the ministry, preaches, we should conclude his doctrine to be true; or else, from the truth of his doctrine, we infer that he is a saint. The first is not possible, for, from a thing to us uncertain, nothing certain can be deduced. The second presupposes, that he, who wishes to learn the true doctrine of Christ, and consequently demands a characteristic of the same, already possesses the true doctrine, and is certain and assured of its possession, and therefore needs no mark. Yet, every one inquires after the true Church of Christ, only because he wishes to attain to the possession of Christ's true doctrine, as well as to acquire the certainty and assurance, that he possesses it. But, should he receive for answer, the true Church is there, where the true doctrine is found, so a reply is evidently given, which is nought else but the question itself, that is to say, nothing at all is answered.

§ XLVII.—Continuation. Rise of the visible Church according to Luther. Ultimate reasons for the truth of an article of faith.

But, as yet this reasoning can scarcely be understood; and its real sense will then only be clearly apprehended, when we have dwelt more at large on the origin of the Church, such as Luther darkly conceived it. His meaning may thus be more accurately expressed as follows. In a man, belief in Christ takes seed; if this faith come to maturity, then is the disciple of Christ formed. But, as a mere believer, he stands only in one relation to God in Christ; he is a member of the invisible Church,

of the concealed and everywhere scattered worshippers of the Lord. But as soon as he gives utterance to his faith, that which was hidden within him, bursts visibly forth, and he appears an open disciple of the Saviour, perceptible to the eyes of the whole world. If he finds now several with the like views, if they associate with him, and together outwardly set forth the substance of that, which they internally recognize as religious truth : then the invisible community becomes visible. The common faith, which inwardly animated and united all, ere they knew each other's sentiments, becomes, as a common doctrine, an outward bond holding them all together. In the same way it is with the sacraments, and the outward worship, which they acknowledge to be ordained by Christ. That Luther had this idea, is evident from what follows. In his apology for free-will, Erasmus took occasion to touch on this weak side, in the Lutheran doctrine respecting the Church. Luther had then made considerable steps in the way of improvement, and solemnly declared, that he approved not the principles of those who, in all their assertions, constantly appealed to the language of the Spirit, in their interior ; and expressed his opinion in what manner the Scripture should be judge in matters of faith. He says, an internal certainty of having seized the true sense of Holy Writ, is to be distinguished from the outward certainty ; the former (the Christian consciousness) consisting in the testimony of the Holy Spirit, which assures each individual, that he is in possession of the truth ; the latter consisting in the Scriptural proofs alleged by the public ministry.* In this

* Luther de servo arbitrio. Opp. tom. iii. fol. 182. Neque illos probo, qui refugium suum ponunt in jactantiâ spiritûs. Nos sic dici-

passage, the clergy are conceived to be the representatives of the Church, which accordingly is of a nature quite visible, and professing the faith of the invisible Church, expressing its consciousness, has a defined system of doctrines, that through the instrumentality of its ministers it defends, and, as the sentence of the saints, holds to be true and inerrable. The visible Church appears, consequently, as the expression and the copy of the invisible.

The following considerations are of great importance, to enable us to form a complete conception of the Lutheran theory of the Church, and of its divergence from the Catholic system. Luther confounded the internal sense of the truth of a proposition, with its outward testimony, or rather, his view of the purely interior and spiritual nature of the Church, whose members were instructed by the Holy Spirit only, ne-

mus, duplici judicio spiritus esse explorandos seu improbandos. Uno interiori, quo per Spiritum sanctum vel donum Dei singulare, quilibet pro se, suâque solius salute illustratus, certissime judicat et discernit omnium dogmata et sensus, de quo dicitur 1 Cor. ii. 1. Spiritualis omnia judicat et a nemine judicatur. Hæc ad fidem pertinet, et necessaria est cuilibet etiam privato Christiano. Hanc superius appellavimus interiorem claritatem Scripturæ sacræ. Alterum est judicium externum, quo non modo pro nobis ipsis, sed et pro aliis et propter aliorum salutem, certissime judicamus spiritus et dogmata aliorum. Hoc judicium est publici ministerii in verbo, et officii externi, et maxime pertinet ad duces et præcones verbi. Quo utimur, dum infirmos in fide roboramus (?) et adversarios refutamus. Sic dicimus, iudice Scripturâ, omnes spiritus in facie Ecclesiæ esse probandos. Nam id oportet apud Christianos esse imprimis ratum atque firmissimum, Scripturas sanctas esse lucem spirituales, ipso sole longe clariorem : præsertim in iis, quæ pertinent ad salutem vel necessitatem. Thus he speaks in the year 1525, not when he wrote to the Bohemians. Here we find the source of what was afterwards put forth, as a claim of the Lutheran clergy.

cessarily involved this confusion. After dilating at length on the manner in which the Christian, amid the various views as to the sense of the written Word, can assure himself that his own view is the true one, he lays down the maxim; “then thou canst be assured of any matter, when thou canst freely and safely assert, this is the pure and genuine truth; for this will I live and die, and he who teaches otherwise, be he who he will, let him be anathema.”* Hereby, Luther made subjective certainty the highest criterion of Gospel truth, without reflecting that, by the very fact, the eternal Word of God had become an *outward teacher, an external authority*, for attesting that that Divine Word had revealed such and such doctrines, was above all things necessary, in order to impart the certainty in question. The passage of St. Paul’s, “If an angel from heaven were to teach another Gospel, let him be anathema,” gave him occasion to make this assertion. But Luther did not consider, that Paul, to whom the Saviour himself had appeared, to whom extraordinary revelations had been made, was in a very different situation from an ordinary Christian. Doubtless, the unconquerable firmness of Christian conviction, is the mark of a true-believing soul; yet, unfortunately, the grossest error hath the power to exert the most lamentable fascination over the mind, and bring it by degrees under bondage, as Luther, had he even been unacquainted with earlier examples in history, might have seen in those fanatics,† whom he so violently combated.

* Luther’s Commentary on the Epist. to the Galat. part i. p. 31. In the writing to the Bohemians, this sentiment is often expressed.

† The Anabaptists.

An expedient, varying in expression, yet the same in substance, is resorted to by Zuinglius, when, in his "Commentaries on True and False Religion," he says, the mark of true doctrine, the sign that we have rightly understood the Divine Word, is the unction and testimony of the Holy Spirit. Faith, according to him, is no science, for it is precisely the learned who are often most addicted to error; and, on this account, faith is no matter for investigation, and is exalted above all strife.*

Zuinglius makes here the most perverse application of a truth, which he had found a thousand times repeated in Catholic writers, especially the mystics. The belief in Jesus Christ, must undoubtedly attest itself; in each one, who possesses it in the right way, it will exalt and extend the consciousness of God; it will pervade and transform his whole existence; infuse into his soul the fullest confidence in God, the deepest tranquillity, and the most joyous consolation; and impart to him a power for all good, and the victory over hell and death. In these personal perceptions, the dogmas professed *by the understanding* as the doctrine of Jesus Christ are tested; and we clearly recognize herein the fulfilment of what that doctrine promised, and the truth of its claim to be a power from God. But, the converse of this proposition can, by no means, be affirmed, that a series of religious tenets, which tend to nourish the piety of an individual, or a greater or smaller circle of men, necessarily contain the doctrine of Christ, or even are not at variance with it. There is no doubt but that the opinion, that man in his regene-

* Zuingli Comment. de verâ et falsâ relig. Opp. tom. ii. fol. 195.

ration worketh nothing, and God alone worketh all things, captivated and strongly excited the religious feelings of Luther. But the inference which he thence drew, that *therefore* that tenet was taught by Christ, cannot be admitted. The writings of Calvin, Beza, Knox, and others show, that, from a belief in the doctrine of an absolute predestination, they and their disciples derived a marvellous ease of mind, a boundless religious enthusiasm (which often even degenerated into a frightful all-destructive fanaticism), and an uncommon energy, activity, and perseverance of conduct. But it thence as little follows, that the doctrine which rendered these Calvinists personally easy, is a christian and apostolic one, as from the mere circumstance, that in the reception of the sacraments, Zuinglius felt himself impressed, strengthened, and solaced by no high Divine power, we could conclude, that, through these channels of salvation, Christ imparts not from the spring, whose waters flow into eternal life. And if all the three Reformers, together with all their followers, had the personal experience and living conviction of never having performed one good work, what would thence follow? Evidently nought else, than that the state of their souls was most lamentable, and we, if they still lived, would be obliged to require them seriously to amend their lives. But by no means will we draw the inference, that it could not have been otherwise; nay, we will urge against them, as a matter of capital reproach, *that out of themselves, out of their own individual life they have deduced an universal law. Christ is our pattern as well as our lawgiver;* but such no creature is. The Lutheran Church is the incarnate spirit of Luther, and therefore thus one-sided.

§ XLVIII.—Continuation. Divergences in the doctrine on the Church, shortly expressed.

Now only, can the differences, between the Catholic and the Lutheran view, be reduced to a short, accurate, and definite expression. The Catholics teach: the visible Church is first, then comes the invisible; the former gives birth to the latter. On the other hand, the Lutherans say the reverse: from the invisible emerges the visible Church: and the former is the ground-work of the latter. In this apparently very unimportant opposition, a prodigious difference is avowed. When Christ began to preach the kingdom of God, it existed nowhere but in him, and in the Divine idea. It came from without to men, and first of all to the apostles, in whom the divine kingdom was thus founded by the Word of God, speaking from without, and after a human fashion unto them; so that it was conveyed to them from without. When, through external media, the religious consciousness of these had been awakened, by the *incarnate* Son of God, and they had, accordingly, received the *outward* calling, to announce the Gospel unto others, they went into countries where, in like manner, the kingdom of God *was not*, but the dominion of Satan; and, as instruments of Christ, working within them, they impressed, from without, the image of the celestial man on the interior of those, who before had been stamped with the image of the earthly one. And as Christ had done unto them, they also did again unto others: they appointed disciples, who, like them, continued to preach the doctrine of salvation, as the Holy Scripture, in numerous passages, loudly declares, and so on perpetually did the in-

visible spring out of the visible Church. This order of things is implied in the very notion of an external, historical revelation, whose entire peculiar essence requires a definite, perpetual, and outward ministry, to which each one must adhere, who will learn the dictates of that revelation. By the testimony of this ministry, and so by an outward testimony, the external revelation is preserved in its truth, purity, and integrity.

But according to Luther, it is quite otherwise. First, it is the Christian consciousness (*interior claritas sacræ Scripturæ*); then comes the outward certainty (*exterior claritas sacræ Scripturæ*); the Church is a community of saints, in which the Gospel is rightly announced; saints, above all, are consequently described as existing, whose origin, extraction and rise, are utterly unknown, and then they preach. How then have they become disciples of Christ? The universal priesthood of all Christians precedes, and out of this grows the special priesthood; but, on the contrary, it is the special which determines the general priesthood, the outward the internal one. If the apostles have not produced the Lord, as little have the disciples of the apostles elected the latter. And wherein, according to Luther, is a man in the last result to find the certainty, that he possesses the truth? In a purely internal act, in the testimony of the Holy Spirit; just as if the revelation in Christ Jesus were an interior one; as if he had not become man—as if in consequence, the question at issue were not about an external testimony, an outward authority, to impart to us the certainty as to what he taught. Hence, the respect for tradition in the Catholic, and the rejection of it in the Protestant Church. By Luther, the outward authority of the Church is converted into an interior one, and the

exterior Word authenticated as divine into the internal voice of Christ and of his Spirit.

Had he wished, from his idea of the Church, to draw a consistent inference in respect to Christ, so he might very well have given up an outward, historical Christ, and an external revelation; nay, he would have been compelled to reject the latter as incongruous. But all Christianity rests on the *incarnate* Son of God: hence, by an appeal to the outward, and written Word, Luther attempted to maintain an unison with an external revelation. Yet, the impossibility of clearing his doctrine of all reasonable doubts, and well-founded objections, which might be adduced, even from the Scriptures themselves, urged him, in his controversy with Catholics, to accord the *final* decision, in religious matters, to the internal Word.* But, when arguing with the fanatics, who themselves appealed to the voice of the Spirit, he then held fast to the outward Word, and even entrenched himself within the authority of the perpetually visible Church.† Hence, from this essential

* As a proof of this, we may cite the Conference of Ratisbon, in the year 1541, at which the speakers, on both sides, had agreed on the article, that to the Church alone belongeth the interpretation of Scripture. When now the notion of the Church came to be discussed, and the Catholics understood by it the outward, visible Church, Melancthon declared at the end, that by the Church were to be understood, *the saints*, that is to say, those in whom God alone had begotten faith.

† Luther, in a letter to Albert, elector of Prussia, writes as follows:—"This article," says he (the real presence of Christ in the sacrament of the altar), "is not a doctrine or opinion invented by men, but clearly founded and laid down in the Gospel by the plain, evident, undoubted words of Christ, and, from the origin of the Christian Churches, down to the present hour, hath been unanimously believed and held throughout the whole world. This is proved by the dear Fathers, books, and

perversion of view, sprang the constant vacillation between the adoption of a visible and an invisible Church, an outward and an internal Word, as the ultimate

writings, both in the Greek and the Latin tongues; and, moreover, by the daily use and practice of this Institution, down to the present day. This testimony of all the holy Christian Churches (had we even nothing more), should be alone sufficient to make us adhere to this article, and not to listen to, or be led by any fanatical spirit; for, it is dangerous and frightful to hear and believe any thing contrary to the unanimous testimony, belief, and doctrine of all the holy Christian Churches, as from the beginning, and with one accord they have now taught, for upwards of fifteen hundred years, throughout the whole world. Had it been a new article, and not from the foundation of the holy Christian Churches; or, had it not been so unanimously held by all Churches, and throughout all Christendom; then it were not dangerous or frightful to doubt it, or to dispute whether it be true. But since it hath been believed from the very origin of the Church, and so far as Christendom extends; whosoever doubts it, doth as much, as if he believed in no Christian Church, and not only condemns the whole Christian Church, as a damned heretic; but condemns even Christ himself, with all the apostles and the prophets, who have laid down this article, which we utter, "I believe in one, holy Christian Church," and have vehemently proclaimed (as Christ himself in Matthew, c. xxviii. 20)—"Behold, I am with ye all days, even to the consummation of the world);" and, (as St. Paul, in 1 Tim. iii. 15)—"The Church is the pillar and the ground of the truth." If God cannot lie, then the Church cannot err. And let not your Highness think that this is my counsel, as if it sprang from me; it is the counsel of the Holy Ghost, who knoweth all hearts and things better than we do; for, such He hath declared by His chosen instrument, St. Paul, when the latter says to Titus (c. iii. 10-11), "An heretical man, thou must know, is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned by his own judgment.—The following passage, too, from the same Reformer, is well worthy of remark:—"We confess, that under the Papacy there is many a Christian blessing—nay, every Christian blessing—a true baptism—a true sacrament of the altar—true power of the keys for the forgiveness of sins—true office of preaching—a true catechism. I say, that under the pope, there is the true Christianity—yea, the right pattern of Christianity," &c. Then he goes on to enforce this truth against his opponents.

ground for the profession or the rejection of any doctrine ; so that, sometimes, the visible Church is made to judge the invisible, sometimes *vice versâ*. Hence, in the succeeding history of the Lutherans, the constant uncertainty, whether and how far the symbolical books were to be received as binding, and in what relation the Scripture stood to them. Hence, the contest, whether Luther had willed, or not, a visible or an invisible Church : he willed both, and taught what was inconsistent with either. But Luther's true spirit gradually gained, in this respect, the most decided victory, yet only in an inverted course : Luther followed a mystical impulse, and what in the dark, tumultuous, irresistible rush of his feelings, appeared to him as the truth, he firmly maintained ; whereas, his later followers have given themselves up to the *rational* element predominant in man ; and, in consequence, whatever seems *rational* to them, whatever they can most easily and most conveniently master by the understanding, they immediately hold to be Scriptural doctrine. As subjectivity must decide, what is matter of history, we see the numberless variations of the doctrine of Christ ; and what seemeth true to each individual, he forthwith places in his Saviour's mouth. So it came, at length, to such a pass, that among Christians themselves, the revelation of God in Christ was doubted, denied, and even ridiculed ; for, a revelation which leaves us in the dark, as to its own purport, and can establish among its own followers no common, settled, and lasting understanding of the same, reveals on that account nothing, and thereby contradicts and refutes itself.

We again repeat it : the meaning of the doctrine, the Word is become flesh, the Word is become man, was never clear to Luther's mind. For, otherwise he

would have seen, in the first place, that it signified far more, than that for thirty years and upwards, the Divine Word had visibly and palpably worked among the Jews in Palestine : secondly, that it intimated far more, than that the Word had therewith ended, that happily before its extinction, it had been recorded on paper. Had Luther been able to rise to the true notion of the *incarnation of the Logos*, he certainly would have conceived the Church to be an institute of education ; but this was never clearly stated by him, and still less from his point of view were it intelligible, had he even most clearly expressed himself on the subject. We cannot perceive in his system, how man really cometh by Holy Writ, nor even indeed, why he needeth instruction and human education, to attain *to true knowledge* ; since God alone, and by interior means, teacheth him. As little can we conceive, wherefore human exhortation, menace, and instruction should be necessary, to induce him to *will* what is good, since this God alone worketh.

§ XLIX.—The truth and the falsehood in Luther's doctrine on the Church.

Luther's notion of the Church is, however, not false, though it is one-sided. If he found it impossible to conceive the Church as a living institute, wherein man becometh holy ; so he still retained the view, that it should consist of saints, whereby its ultimate and highest object is declared. In more than one place, he says, he attaches great weight to the definition of the Church, as a community of saints ; because each individual can thence infer what he should be. In his system, the interior part of the Church, which is yet

the most important, is everywhere put forward ; and that no one in the Divine kingdom can enjoy the true rights of citizenship, when he belongs only outwardly to the Church, and hath not entered into the true spirit of Christ, is in a praiseworthy manner pointed out. Moreover, it is not to be doubted, that Christ maintains his Church in the power of victory, by means of those, who live in his faith, belong to him in heart and spirit, and rejoice in his second coming. It is also not to be doubted, that these are the true supporters of his truth ; that without them it would soon be forgotten, turn into pure error, or degenerate into an empty, hollow formalism. Yes, without doubt, these—the invisible, who have been changed and glorified into the image of Christ, are the supporters of the visible Church : the wicked in that Church, the unbelievers, the hypocrites, the dead members in the body of Christ, would be unable for a single day to preserve the Church, even in her exterior forms. Nay, as far as in them lies, they do all to distract the Church, to sacrifice her to base passions, to pollute her, and abandon her to the scorn and mockery of her enemies. With never-failing profusion doth the Lord raise up, in the fulness of His strength, men, through whom He sheds over his Church, light and the newness of life ; but, because after a human fashion, they cannot be infallibly recognized as his disciples, and even ought not to be so, in order not to promote confidence in mere man, and because his followers are to be called after no man, be he Athanasius, or Arius, Augustine, Luther, or Calvin, we are by him referred to *his own* institution, wherein the truth can never fail, because he, the truth and the life, ever abideth in it.

Luther, moreover, has rightly seen the necessity of

admitting, that a revelation, emanating immediately from God, requireth a divinely instituted Church, and the Christian faith a far higher, than a mere human guarantee. But his fault was, that he did not seriously weigh what was signified by the words, the immediate revelation in Christ is external; for, otherwise he would have understood, that a divinely instituted Church is necessarily visible, founded as it is by the Word of God become visible, and that the warranty of faith must needs be external. Vast were the consequences of this want of perception. In the religious community, which owes its existence to Luther, the so-called invisible revelation in the human mind, has since determined the conception of the visible, nay, even the written revelation; and, according as each one believes, God reveals himself to him in his interior, he explains and distorts the outward Word, and against such arbitrary interpretations, no Lutheran can allege any solid objection, *since from the inward emanates the external Church.*

Lastly, the proposition, that the internal Church is to be first established, and then the exterior one, is, in one respect, completely true, and here by Luther was deceived. We are not *living* members of the external Church, until we belong to the interior one. What hath been imparted to us from without, must be reproduced by and within us; the objective must become subjective, ere we be entitled to consider ourselves true members of the Christian Church. Thus far, certainly, the invisible is to be ranked before the visible Church; and the latter is eternally renovated out of the former. But, this kingdom of God begins, grows, and ripens within us, after it has first externally encountered us, and made the first steps to receive us into its bosom. The act of exterior excitement, instruction, and educa-

tion, is ever the first condition of life to what is internally excited, taught, and educated; but, as soon as the exterior hath passed into the interior, then the inward becometh, in its turn, the outward; and the image, which from without, was impressed upon the interior, is reflected from the interior on the exterior. But, as Luther wished to break with the existing outward Church, he was obliged to give the *absolute* precedence to the invisible Church, and consider himself as the immediate envoy of God.* But, by exalting, into a general principle, his view of the relation of the internal to the external Church, he fell into the greatest embarrassments. On one hand, he desired (and in perfect consistency with the view he entertained of himself, as a divinely inspired evangelist), that the doctrine, which coming forth from his interior as the voice of God, he had announced abroad, should be merely re-echoed by his disciples: and, thus from him, too, the visible should again bring forth and absolutely determine the invisible Church:—a condition, which utterly annihilated his own principle.† But, if he held to the latter principle,

* After his journey from the Wartburg, Luther, as is well known, wrote from Borna to the elector Frederick, as follows:—"He had received his Gospel," said he, "not from men, but from heaven alone, from Jesus Christ; and, therefore is he a Christian and an evangelist, and such he wished to be called in future." Even Calvin, in his answer to Sadolet's Epistle to the Genevans, appeals to this immediate mission: Opusc. p. 106. "Ministerium meum, quod Dei vocatione fundatum ac sanctum fuisse non dubito." P. 107. "Ministerium meum, quod quidem ut à Christo esse novi," etc.

† In modern times it has often been denied, that Luther had desired to lay down for all future ages dogmatic decisions. But, the sort of proof, which is adduced, would, in all cases, where personal interests were not concerned, be declared to be anything but satisfactory. Men cannot, in the least degree, have transported themselves into the spirit

and considered each one like himself, as internally and immediately taught by God alone; then the most oppo-

of those ages, and, least of all, have attended to the character of the Reformers, and particularly of Luther, when they advance such a statement. If the doctrinal uncertainty of the greater part of his present worshippers, had been one of Luther's peculiarities, it would be difficult to account for his constancy and perseverance in his career, nay, for the very origin of his reformation. Yet, in proof of what has been asserted in the text, we may cite, though briefly, the words of the reformer himself. In his reply to Erasmus (Adv. Erasm. Roterod. lib. l. p. 182, b.) he lays down the principle; "*fidei est non falli*," which he applies, in the passage following, to particular articles. Erasmus had said, "if the doctrine of free-will had been an error, God would certainly not have tolerated it in his Church, nor have revealed it to any saint." To this Luther answers: "*Primum non dicimus, errorem hunc esse in ecclesiâ suâ toleratum à Deo, nec in ullo suo sancto; ecclesia enim Spiritû Dei regitur, sancti aguntur Spiritû Dei, Rom. viii. Et Christus cum ecclesiâ suâ manet usque ad consummationem mundi. Matt. xxviii. Et ecclesia est firmamentum et columna veritatis. 2 Tim. iii. Hæc, inquam, novimus, nam sic habet et Symbolum omnium nostrum: credo ecclesiam sanctam Catholicam, ut impossibile sit, illam errare etiam in minimo articulo.*" Nay, Luther adds: "*Atque si etiam donemus, aliquos electos in errore teneri in totâ vitâ, tamen ante mortem necesse est, ut redeant in viam,*" etc. In his opinion on the imperial decree of the 22nd September, 1530, he says to the same effect: "Whoso professeth the Augsburg Confession, will be saved; although its truth should become manifest to him only later: *this confession must endure until the end of the world, and the day of judgment.*" See Bucholz's History of the Reign of Ferdinand I, vol. iii. Vienna, 1832, p. 576 (in German,—a work where the history of the diet at Augsburg, with all the ecclesiastical negotiations, is most copiously and instructively detailed. Hence, we can, by no means, agree with Baumgarten Crusius, when, in his "Manual of the History of Christian Dogmas," he thus blames the more precise definitions of the Lutheran doctrine, in the formulary of concord: "These thoughts were rendered *matters of dogma*, while, at the origin of the reformation, they had in their higher, more spiritual sense, been opposed to the worldly spirit of the ruling Church, and had been meant to express only the idea of human helplessness, and of the devotion of human

site doctrines were proclaimed, and the internal voice of God contradicted and belied itself. From this dilemma, his disciples to this day have never been able to extricate themselves.

§ L.—Negative doctrines of the Lutherans in regard to the Church.

If we would now point out more accurately, the negative doctrines of the Lutherans, in regard to the Church; it is easy, in the first place, to conceive wherefore the papal supremacy was, and must necessarily have been, rejected by them. The opinion, that Christ had founded only an invisible Church, is absolutely incompatible with the other, that he had given to it a visible head: the one notion destroys the other. Luther looking on every determination of belief, through human mediation, as equivalent to what was diabolical, the idea of the papal supremacy, wherein the doctrine of the dependence of each member on the whole body is most distinctly expressed, must (independently of the faults of individual pontiffs, which not unfrequently cast a shade on the history of the Papacy), have appeared to his mind as anti-Christian, and the Pope himself as Anti-Christ. For the Papacy is quite inconsistent with the idea of a purely internal, and invisible, and so far exclusively divine Church, and encroaches, according to this system, on the office of Christ, the sole and invisible head of the Church, who alone, and by internal means, teacheth his disciples, and without any intermediate agency, draweth them to himself. When Protestants so often repeat, Christ is alone the head of the

life to God." See his *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, part i. p. 595. Jena, 1832.

Church ; the assertion has exactly the same sense, as when Luther says, Christ is the sole teacher, and should accordingly be estimated in precisely the same manner. Moreover, if the Protestants, of the present day especially, find the idea of the Papacy objectionable, this aversion is still more conceivable. Of what could the Popedom exhibit the unity ? Of the most palpable, decided, and irreconcilable contradictions ; this, indeed, would be an utter impossibility :—it could only be the representative of what was in itself a thousandfold and most radically opposed, and this anti-Christ, Satan himself alone could be. Of what body could the Pontiff be the head ? A body, whose members declare themselves independent one of the other : a thing which is inconceivable. The fault of Protestants is this, that what with them is impracticable, what from their point of view may with indisputable consistency be rejected, they would refuse to the Christian Church also, which is anything but a distracted, self-contradictory, self-annihilating, self-belying thing, that ever at the same moment utters the affirmative and the negative. If a considerable portion of Protestants, instead of naming Christ their invisible head, would designate him as their *unknown* head, concealed from their view, they would at least give utterance to an historical truth. The same judgment, moreover, which Protestants must form of the Papacy, they naturally pass on the Catholic view of Episcopacy.

Lastly, in respect to tradition, it is sufficiently evident from what has been said, and it has already been explicitly shown, why in the twofold signification above pointed out, Protestants cannot concede to it the same place, which it occupies in the Catholic system. It has occasionally been said, however, that the Reformers had

not rejected Tradition “in the ideal sense;” but only *Traditions*. It is certainly not to be doubted, that still partially subdued by that old ecclesiastical spirit, which, on their secession from the Church, they had unconsciously carried away with them, they believed in the same, and read the Holy Scriptures in its sense. Though *materially*, they did not reject every portion of Tradition, yet they did so *formally*. For, if indeed, they acknowledged the doctrinal decisions of the Church, as embodied in the first four œcumenical Councils, they did so, not on account of their ecclesiastical *objectivity*, but because, according to their own *subjective* views, they found them confirmed by Holy Writ. But the Gospel truth, which hath been delivered over to the Church, for preservation and for propagation, remaineth truth, whether, in consequence of a subjective inquiry, or, of a pretended internal illumination, it be acknowledged or be rejected. Hence, the ecclesiastical traditional principle is this: such and such a doctrine,—for instance, the divinity of Christ,—is a Christian evangelical truth, because the Church, the institution invested with authority from Christ, declares it to be his doctrine;—not because such or such an individual subjectively holds it, as the result of his Scriptural reading, for a Christian truth. The Bible is ever forced to assume the form of its readers: it becomes little with the little, and great with the great, and is, therefore, made to pass through a thousand transformations, according as it is reflected in each individuality. If that individuality be shallow, flat, and dull, the Scripture is so represented through its medium: it is made to take the colour of the most one-sided and perverse opinions, and is abused to the support of every folly. In itself, therefore, and without any other medium, the Bible

cannot be considered, by the Church, as a rule of faith : on the contrary, the doctrine of the Church is the rule, whereby the Scripture must be investigated. The Reformers failing to acknowledge this great truth, their partial agreement with Tradition was purely *accidental*; as is most clearly evidenced by the fact, that, in the sequel, nearly all those positive doctrines of Christianity, which Luther and the first Reformers still maintained, have been cast off by their disciples, without their ever ceasing to profess themselves members of the Protestant Church. On no point did the Reformers recognize Tradition for the sake of its objectivity; and, therefore, they rejected it, wherever it accorded not with their own subjective caprices. What doctrine doth tradition more clearly attest, than that of free-will? Yet, this they rejected. In short, they entirely merged the objective historical Christianity into their own subjectivity, and were consequently *forced* to throw off Tradition.

Accordingly, they refused obedience to the Church—deeming it ignoble and slavish. They forgot that, a divine authority impresses upon the obedience also, which pays homage to it, the stamp of divinity, and exalts it as much above servitude, as the spirit is raised above the flesh. It is remarkable, that no one any longer doubts, but that an outward, fixed, eternally immutable moral law, though not in all its parts first established by Christ, yet hath been by Him confirmed and brought to greater perfection. This rule of will and of action, every Christian recognizes; and, however far short of it he may fall in his own conduct, yet, he never thinks of changing it, according to his subjective moral point of view; nor, in the commission of his faults, flattering himself, that the standard, according to which he should act, and that according to which he, in reality, doth

act, perfectly correspond. But, the necessity of a like fixed and unchangeable standard for the intelligence is disputed. Here each one is to give himself up, to the guidance of his own subjective feelings and fancies, and to be certain, that what he feels and thinks, is truly felt and thought; although any individual, who has only attended for some weeks to his own train of thoughts, may easily perceive, that in this field he is not a whit stronger, than in the sphere of morals. That the Bible alone cannot, in itself, constitute such a settled, outward rule, nor was ever so intended by Christ, no one surely, after the awful experience which, in our times especially, has been made, and is still daily made, will feel any longer disposed to deny.

§ LI.—Doctrine of the Calvinists on the Church.

The Calvinists adopted Luther's general views, respecting the Church, without alteration, and solemnly confirmed them in their Symbolical writings.* But Calvin is distinguished by many peculiarities, which deserve to be mentioned. The phenomena, which in the whole compass of ecclesiastical life, from the commencement

* Zuingl. Commentar. de verâ et falsa Relig. Opp. tom. ii. fol. 197, where he comprises, in ten short propositions, his whole doctrine on the Church. Calvin Instit. l. iv. c. 1. fol. 190, seq.; Confess. Helvet. i. c. xvii. ed. Augs. p. 47; Helvet. ii. Art. xiv; Anglic. Art. xix. p. 133: which, however, very clearly points out the visible character of the Church: "*Ecclesia Christi visibilis est cœtus fidelium, in quo verbum Dei purum prædicatur, et sacramenta, quoad ea, quæ necessario exigantur, juxta Christi institutum recte administrantur.*" Very different from this, on the other hand, is the Confessio Scotorum, Art. xvi. p. 156. The Hungarian Confession has nothing to say respecting the Church; but, on the other hand, it has a section *de vestitû pastorum*, p. 251.

of the revolution attempted by Luther, down to the flourishing period of Calvin, had presented themselves to the attention of the observer, had not passed by, without making the deepest impression upon the mind of the Genevan Reformer. He had observed the boundless tyranny, which had followed in the train of the new principles: nor had he overlooked the fact, that the idea of a Christian put forward by his predecessor, as an independent, all-sufficing being, capable, from the fulness of his own spirit, of satisfying all his higher wants, is a mere fiction, which all experience belies.* He had been struck with the fact, that the rulers of the new Church were devoid of all influence and respect; that the people, which had been taught to look on them as the mere work of its own hands, denied them frequently the most indispensable obedience; and that, if temporal princes had not interposed their authority, all order and discipline would have been subverted.† As at Geneva, the principal scene of Calvin's activity, the ecclesiastical reformation was connected with a civil revolution, the wildest anarchy had broken through the restraints of public morals, and matter for the most earnest reflection was thus offered in abundance.

* Calvin. Instit. l. iv. c. 1. § v. fol. 572. "Etsi externis mediis alligata non est Dei virtus, tamen ordinario docendi modo alligavit: quem dum recusant tenere fanatici homines, multis se exitialibus laqueis involvunt. Multos impellit vel superbia, vel fastidium, vel æmulatio, ut sibi persuadeant privatim legendo et meditando se posse satis proficere, atque ita contemnant publicos cœtus et prædicationem supervacuam ducant. Quoniam autem sacrum unitatis vinculum, quantum in se est, solvunt vel abrumpunt," etc.

† Loc. cit. § ii. fol. 375. "Ejus (Satanæ) arte factum est, ut pura verbi prædication aliquot sæculis evanuerit: et nunc eâdem improbitate incumbit ad labefactandum ministerium; quod tamen sic in ecclesiâ Christus ordinavit, ut illo sublato hujus ædificatio pereat," etc.

Hence, Calvin thought it necessary to straiten the bonds, which united the individual with the general body, to excite a new reverence for the Church, (of which Luther had always spoken in such terms of disparagement, and whereof, indeed, he had never formed a clear conception), as well as to establish, on a more solid basis, the authority of its rulers. He carefully collected all that had ever been said upon the Church, in any wise good or useful for his object; and did not even hesitate to transplant into his garden, many a flower from the so-much-detested *Corpus Juris canonici*; taking care, however, not to name the place of its extraction. So he preferred, to adopt in his "Institutes of the Christian Religion," propositions, which, in the Protestant system, are utterly untenable and baseless, than consistently to enforce the principles, that he had inherited from Luther. At the very commencement of his Treatise on the Church, he points out the natural ignorance, indolence, and frivolity of man, and the consequent necessity of certain institutions to implant, cherish, and mature the doctrines of faith. In the Church, hath the treasure of the Gospel been deposited, he proceeds to say; pastors and teachers have been instituted by God, *and been invested with authority*, to the end, that preaching might never fail, and a holy concord in Faith, and a right order might constantly obtain.*

But when his reason made him the reproach, how, if the Church were really so constituted, he could feel

* Calvin. Instit. lib. iv. c. i. fol. 370. "Quia autem ruditās nostra et segnities (addo etiam ingenii vanitatem) externis subsidiis indigent pastores instituit ac doctores (Deus), quorum ore suos doceret: eos auctoritate instruxit; nihil denique omisit, quod ad sanctum fidei consensum et rectum ordinem faceret."

himself justified in severing all ties of connexion with the one in existence; he then stunned his conscience with the most violent invectives against her; satisfied as he was, that the generation which had once begun to swear by men, and to revere their opinions, as the Word of God, would easily take such sallies of furious passion, as a substitute for solid argument.*

After these introductory observations, Calvin speaks, first, of the invisible Church, and requires his disciples, in the first place, to be firmly convinced, that such a Church doth in reality exist—namely, a host of elect, who, though they do not see each other face to face, yet are united in one faith, in one hope, in one charity, and in the same Holy Spirit, as members under the one Christ, their common head. In the second place, he requires them to believe, with undoubting assurance, that they themselves belong to this invisible Church, which can be only one, since a division of Christ is impossible. Then, he adds: though a desolate wilderness on all sides surrounds us, which seemeth to cry out, the Church is vanished; yet, let us be assured, that the death of Jesus is not unprofitable, and that God knows how to preserve his followers, even in the obscurest corners. The reader will not fail to observe, that together with the reasons, which are to be looked for in his doctrine of absolute predestination, there was an especial motive, that induced Calvin to enforce on his disciples the conviction, that they belonged to an invisible Church. This was the general demoralization, which he saw prevailing among them, and which threatened to undermine the belief, that the so-called Refor-

* Loc. cit. c. ii. fol. 381-86.

mation, had in reality been brought about.* So he diverts their view from the world of reality, and turns it to the obscurity of the invisible world, in order to afford, to that eternal longing of the Christian soul after communion, a satisfaction which the visible Church evidently denied. He immediately passes over to the latter, to impart to it a more solid and beautiful form, to insure its efficacy and its influence in the training up of believers, to make the visible Church appear as the reflection of the invisible, and, in this way, to attempt to reconcile, by degrees, the members of the latter with those of the former.

How salutary, nay, how indispensable, is this view of the nature of the visible Church, says he, is evident alone, from her glorious appellation of “mother.” There is no coming into life, unless she conceives us in her womb, unless she brings us forth, nourishes us at her breasts, and finally watches over and protects us, until we throw off this mortal coil, and become like unto the angels. For, as long as we live, our weakness will not admit of our being discharged from school. Let us consider, moreover, he continues, that out of the pale of the Church, there is no forgiveness of sins, and

* Loc. cit. § xiii. fol. 376. “Dum enim apud eos, quibus Evangelium annuntiatur, ejus doctrinæ non respondere vitæ fructum vident, nullam illic esse ecclesiam statim judicant. Justissima quidem est offensio, cui plus satis occasionis hoc miserrimo sæculo præbemus; nec excusare licet maledictam ignaviam, quam Dominus impunitam non sinet: uti jam gravibus flagellis castigare incipit. Væ ergo nobis, qui tam dissoluta flagitiorum licentia committimus, ut propter nos vulnerentur imbecilles conscientiæ.—Quia enim non putant esse ecclesiam, ubi non est solida vitæ puritas et integritas, scelerum odio a legitimâ ecclesiâ discedunt, dum a factione improborum declinare se putant. Aiunt ecclesiam Christi sanctam esse,” etc.

no salvation: Isaiah and Joel attest it, and Ezechiel concurs with them. We see from hence, that God's paternal grace, and the especial testimony of the spiritual life, are confined to his flock; so that separation from the Church is ever pernicious.

Calvin appeals to Ephesians, c. iv. 11, where St. Paul says, "that Christ gave some apostles; and some prophets; and some others, evangelists; and some others, pastors and doctors; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ; until we all meet in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the age of the fulness of Christ:"—a passage which the Catholic Church adduces in support of the view that she takes of herself. After this quotation, the Reformer adds: "We see that God, *though in one moment He could render His own followers perfect*, yet, would have them grow up to maturity only by means of an education by the Church. We see, moreover, the way marked out, wherein these plans of God are to be unfolded; for, to the pastors is the preaching of the Divine Word intrusted: all must conform to this precept, so that, with a mild and docile spirit (*mansueto et docili spiritu*) they give themselves up to the guidance of the teachers selected for that purpose. Long before had the prophet Isaiah, characterized the Church by this sign, when he said, "The spirit which is in thee, and the words, which I have placed in thy mouth, will never depart from thy mouth, nor from the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord." Hence, it follows, that those deserve to perish of hunger and misery, who despise the celestial food of the soul, which is administered from above through the hands of the Church. That we may know that in earthly vessels,

an incomparable treasure is presented to our acceptance, God Himself appears, and as far as He is the Founder of this order of things, desires to be acknowledged as ever present in His institution. In like manner, as He referred not His chosen people of old to angels, but raised up on earth teachers, who performed truly the office of angels: so He desires now to instruct us after a human fashion. And in like manner, as in ancient times, He was not content with merely revealing His law, but appointed as interpreters of the same, the priests, from whose lips the people were to hear its true sense explained: so it is now His will, that we should not merely be engaged with the reading of Holy Writ; nay, He hath instituted teachers, that we may be supported by their aid. From hence a two-fold advantage springs. On one hand, the Almighty best tries our obedience, when we so hearken to His ministers, as if He spake himself; and, on the other hand, He condescends to our weakness, by choosing rather to address us after a human manner, through the medium of interpreters, in order to draw us to Himself, than to repel us by the voice of His thunders. Calvin, after remarking, that in all apostasies from the Church, arrogance or jealousy ever lies at the bottom, and that he, who severs the sacred bonds of unity, will not fail to incur the just chastisement for this godless adultery—to wit, spiritual blindness through the most poisonous errors and the most detestable illusions; proceeds to say, “the more abominable therefore are the apostles, who aim at a division in the Church: it is as if they chased the sheep away from the fold, and delivered them up to the jaws of the wolf.”*

* Loc. cit. c. i. § v. fol. 372.

Calvin is as inexhaustible in his own self-refutation, as he is unshaken in his confidence in the thoughtlessness of the men, from whom he seriously expects, that the grounds, which condemn his own disobedience against the Catholic Church, they will good-naturedly take for proofs, that they owe submission to him and to his institutions. As we, he says in another place, profess an invisible Church, which is seen by the eye of God alone ; so are we bound to revere a Church, which is perceptible to men, and to persevere in its communion.* He never forgets to point out as a mark of a true Christian community, its veneration for the ministry, and for the office of preaching;† and, if Luther said, the true Church is there to be found, where the Gospel is rightly announced ; so Calvin adds, it is there to be found where the preaching of the Divine Word *is heard with obedience*. “Where, as he expresses himself, the preaching of the Gospel is received with reverence, there neither a deceptive, nor a doubtful image of the Church is presented ; and no one will go unpunished, who contemns her authority, or despises her exhortations, or rejects her counsels, or mocks her chastisements, still less who apostatizes from her, and dissolves her unity. For such value doth our Lord attach to communion with His Church, that he is held for an apostate and an unbeliever, who obstinately secedes from any [particular reformed] commu-

* Calvin. lib. iv. c. 1. n. 7. fol. 374. “Quemadmodum ergo nobis invisibilem, solius Dei oculis conspicuam ecclesiam credere necesse est, ita hanc, quæ respectu hominum ecclesia dicitur, observare, ejusque communionem colere jubemur.”

† Loc. cit. § ix. fol. 374. “Quæ (multitudo) si ministerium *habet* verbi, et *honorat*, si sacramentorum administrationem, ecclesia procul dubio haberi et censi meretur.”

nity, *should it otherwise revere the true ministry of the Word and of the sacraments.* It is certainly no slight thing, that it is called ‘the pillar and the ground of the truth,’ as well as the ‘House of God.’ Hereby, St. Paul means to say, the Church is the faithful preserver of the truth, that it may never be lost in the world; for, by her ministry and her aid, God wished to preserve the pure preaching of His Word, and show himself a kind parent, who nourishes us with spiritual food, and provides all, which can minister to our salvation. Even this is no mean praise that the Church is called the ‘chosen one,’ the bride elect, who must be without spot and without wrinkle, the body of the Lord. Hence, it follows, that separation from the Church is tantamount to a denial of God and of Christ; and we should guard the more against the heinousness of schism, for while, as far as in us lies, we thus labour for the destruction of Divine Truth, we deserve to call down upon ourselves the full weight of God’s wrath. And no more detestable crime can be imagined, than by a sacrilegious infidelity to violate the marriage, which the only-begotten Son of God hath deigned to contract with the Church.”*

Lastly, Calvin, for good reasons, endeavours to enforce on his readers the conviction, that no magnitude of moral corruption can ever deprive the Church of its inherent character,† and that those, who, on this point

* Loc. cit. § x. fol. 374-375.

† Loc. cit. c. ii. § i. fol. 381. “Ubicunque integrum exstat et illibatum (verbi et sacramentorum ministerium) nullis morum vitiis aut morbis impediri, quominus ecclesiæ nomen sustineat.” c. i. § xvi. fol. 377. “Hoc tamen reperimus nimiam morositatem ex superbiâ magis et fastû falsâque sanctitatis opinione, quam ex verâ sanctitate veroque ejus studio nasci. Itaque qui ad faciendam ab ecclesiâ defec-

are too rigid, and in consequence incite to defection, are generally swollen with arrogance, and impelled by a pernicious self-complacence. He even adds, that a certain obscuration of the true faith should not be overrated.*

From these principles of Calvin, we can understand, why he retained Ordination, and even under the condition, that it should be administered not by the people, but by the presbytery.† He even evinced an incli-

tionem sunt aliis audaciores, et quasi antesignani, ii ut plurimum nihil aliud causæ habent, nisi ut omnium contemptû ostendant se aliis esse meliores."

* Loc. cit. § xii. fol. 374. "Quin etiam poterit vel in doctrinâ, vel in sacramentorum administratione vitii quippiam obrepere, quod alienare nos ab ejus communione non debeat." We could wish that space permitted us to cite some passages, from the writings of Theodore Beza, upon the Church. What Calvin teaches, Beza excellently applies. We need only peruse Beza's Epistle to a certain Alamannus, "ecclesiæ Lugdunensis turbatorem," in order to learn how Calvin's maxims were practically enforced. See Theodori Bezæ Vezelii epist. theolog. liber unus, Genev. 1573, p. 48. May we not consider it as a result of Calvin's deeper conception of the Church, surviving to this day, that even now the German Calvinistic theologians have, on this subject, furnished far more excellent matter than the Lutheran ones? It is Schleiermacher and Marheineke (and the latter, in his book of religious instruction for the Higher Gymnasia, still more than in the Manual of dogmatic Theology, destined for University Lectures), who, among the modern Protestants, have by far the best treated this subject. Marheineke had already written much that was excellent on the Church, before he attached himself to the Hegelian school, from which certainly a better spirit has emanated.

† Loc. cit. lib. iv. c. 3. § 11-16. fol. 389-392; lib. iv. c. 14. § 20. fol. 418. "Sacramenta duo instituta, quibus nunc Christiana ecclesia utitur. Loquor autem de iis, quæ in usum totius ecclesiæ sunt instituta. Nam impositionem manuum, quâ ecclesiæ ministri in suum munus initiantur, ut non invitatus patior vocari sacramentum, ita inter ordinaria sacramenta non numero." If, by sacramentum ordinarium, Calvin un-

nation to acknowledge Holy Orders as a sacrament. Certainly from this point of view, the remarkable fact, that in the English Calvinistic Church episcopacy was retained, finds here its deepest motive; although it is not to be denied, that various other circumstances also concurred to this retention. With Luther's first opinions, no episcopacy could have existed; and the Danish and Swedish episcopal system, is essentially different from the Anglican.* But, hereby in the Anglican Church, the internal self-contradiction was carried to the extremest pitch. A Catholic hierarchy, and a Protestant system of faith in one and the same community! The Anglican bishops boast, that by means of Catholic ordination, they descend in an unbroken succession from the apostles; and, are accordingly, in a most intimate and living connection with the ancient Church; and yet, by their participation in the ecclesiastical revolution, they broke off the chain of tradition.

How great, therefore, must be our astonishment, when Calvin makes belief in the divinity of the Scriptures, depend on the testimony of the Holy Spirit in the interior man, and when he could descend to such a pitiable misinterpretation of the true proposition of St. Augustine's: "I would not believe in the Sacred Scriptures, if the authority of the Church did not determine me thereto."† Here again that effort was relaxed, which

derstands, quod in usum totius ecclesiæ (omnium fidelium) institutum est, so the Catholic Church quite agrees with him.

* Confess. Anglic. Art. xxxvi.

† Calvin Instit. lib. i. c. 7. § 3. fol. 15. "Maneat ergo fixum, quos Spiritus sanctus intus docuit, solide acquiescere in Scripturâ, et hanc quidem esse *αυτόπιστον*, neque demonstrationibus et rationi subjici eam fas esse: quam tamen meretur apud nos certitudinem spiritûs testimonio consequi. Talis ergo est persuasio, quæ rationes non requirat:

had so earnestly endeavoured to oppose an objective matter to subjective caprice; and evidently, in order to obviate the possible consequences, which, from the undeniable fact, that in and by the Catholic Church, the canon of the Bible had been settled, and its several books preserved in their integrity, might be deduced in favour of that Church.*

talis notitia, cui optima ratio constat, nempe in qua securius constantiusque mens acquiescit, quam in ullis rationibus; talis denique sensus, qui nisi ex cœlesti revelatione nasci nequeat."

* Loc. cit. § 1, fol. 14. "Sic enim magno cum ludibrio Spiritûs sancti quærunt: equis nobis fidem faciat, hæc a Deo prodiisse? Equis salva ac intacta ad nostram usque ætatem pervenisse certiores reddat? Equis persuadeat, librum hunc reverenter excipiendum, alterum numero expungendum, nisi certam istorum omnium regulam ecclesia præscriberet? Pendet igitur, inquiunt, ab ecclesiæ determinatione et quæ scripturæ reverentia debeatur, et qui libri in ejus catalogo censendi sint. Ita sacrilegi homines, dum sub ecclesiæ prætextû volunt effrænata tyrannidem evehere, nihil curant, quibus se et alios absurditatibus illaqueent, modo hoc unum extorqueant apud simplices, ecclesiam nihil non posse." Moreover, no Catholic so expresses himself, that it depends on the Church to determine what veneration be due to the sacred writings, and what books are to be held as canonical; but Catholics have at all times asserted, that the Church is only a witness and a guarantee, that the canonical Scriptures are really what they are considered to be. Calvin, however, expresses himself still more honestly than Luther, who, in his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*, c. i. p. 30 (Wittenberg, 1556, part 1.), says: "So the Church should have power and authority over Holy Writ; as the canonists and the sententiarii (schoolmen) have written against God, and in the most shameless manner. The ground which some assign for this opinion is, the Church hath not approved of and adopted more than four gospels; therefore there are only four, and had the Church adopted more, there would have been more. But now, if the Church hath the power, according to her good will and pleasure, to adopt and to approve of gospels, what and how many she chooses, so it thence follows that the authority of the Church is above the Gospel." This was now, indeed, easy to be refuted, as even Luther himself refutes his own fiction.

Yet these principles of Calvin, emanated from the thoroughly subjective nature of Protestantism; and, it must be admitted, that his views, on the Church, are far more inconsistent with the inmost spirit of the reformation, than his opinion, as to the mode of assuring ourselves of the divine origin of any sacred writing, is with his doctrine on the Church. But at all events, it is highly honourable to his perspicacity, as well as to his Christian spirit, that he saw, or at least felt, that by means of mere learned investigation, the believer could obtain no satisfactory result: that on account of the obscurity, which involves the origin of many of the sacred writings, and the formation of the canon itself, and which spreads in general over the first two centuries of the Church, doubts as to the genuineness of one or other canonical Scripture may ever be raised—doubts on the final solution, whereof faith cannot remain suspended: and that accordingly, some higher guarantee must be sought for. Such he found, following out earlier indications; and what he found was not false, but one-sided, unsatisfactory, and cheerless for the Church. That through such principles an opening was made to the desolation of the sanctuary, proceeding from a one-sided culture of the religious spirit, Calvin might have learned from Luther's views touching the Biblical canon. Where the latter "did not perceive the Spirit,"* that is to say, did not find the reflection of his own spirit, he forthwith believed the suspicion of spuriousness to be well-founded. But, who can ultimately decide on this test of the Spirit, which a book of Scripture doth abide or not, when that book is rejected by one party, and defended by another. Neither

† "Den Geist verspürte." These are Luther's own words.—*Trans.*

can be refuted, because each exalts individual sentiment, as the highest and the ultimate criterion of certainty; and will not let its religious faith be moulded according to the objective doctrine of the Bible, but will itself, according to its own pleasure, determine what is, or is not Scripture. Accordingly, from the language of the Spirit, it can never be decided, whether Matthew, Mark, Paul, Peter, and the rest, have written any book; at most, it declares that a Christian is the author of such a writing. But when the question turns on the canonicity of the Scriptures, it is the former, and not merely the latter fact, which we desire to know; for, the apostles only we hold to be unerring, but no one besides.*

* *Confessio Gallica* (c. iv. lib. i. p. 111) agrees with Calvin when it says: “*Hos libros agnoscimus esse canonicos, id est, ut fidei nostræ normam et regulam habemus, atque non tantum ex communi ecclesiæ consensû, sed etiam multo magis ex testimonio et intrinseca Spiritûs sancti persuasione: quo suggerente docemur, illos ab aliis libris ecclesiasticis discernere, qui ut sint ules (utiles?) non sunt tamen ejusmodi, ut ex iis constitui possit aliquis fidei articulus.*”

CHAPTER VI.

THE CHURCH IN THE NEXT WORLD, AND ITS CONNEXION
WITH THE CHURCH MILITANT.

§ LII.—Doctrine of Catholics on this matter.

HITHERTO we have considered the Church only in her terrestrial being and essence; and her supermundane part remains still to be described. The faithful, who, summoned away from hence, have quitted their visible communion with us, and have passed into another state of existence, do not (so the Catholic Church teaches), thereby sever the bonds of connexion with us. On the contrary, holy love, which was transferred from a higher order of existence to this lower world, perpetually enfolds in her sacred bands, all those whom she hath once held in her embraces, (provided only they have not wilfully torn themselves from her), and amid the dissolution of all earthly energies, still retains her eternal power. All now, who, with the hallow of love, have departed hence, as also those higher created spiritual beings, who, though they never lived with us in the relations of space and time, yet, like us, stand under the same head Christ Jesus, and are sanctified in the same Holy Spirit, form together one Church—one great and closely united confederacy with us.* But, not all

* Cardinal Sadoletus, in his letter to the Genevans, admirably expresses the pith of the doctrine of the Catholic Church: “*Sin mortalis anima sit, edamus, et bibamus, inquit apostolus, paulo enim post moriemur: sin autem sit immortalis, ut certo est, unde, quæso, tantum et*

believers, who have been members of this terrestrial Church, and have departed from it, with the sign of the covenant of love, enter immediately, on their passage into eternity, into those relations of bliss, destined, from the beginning, for those who love God in Christ. According as they quit this earthly life, either slightly touched by divine love, or by it effectually freed from the stains of sin, they pass into different forms of a new existence. The former are transferred to a state, suited to the still defective, moral, and religious life of their souls, and which is destined to bring them to perfection: the latter to a state of happiness, corresponding to their consummate sanctification. The first, like the members of the Church terrestrial, are with reason included in the suffering Church; for their peculiar existence must be considered as one, not only still passing through the fire of purification,* but, as also subjected to punishment; for, it depended only on themselves, by the right use of their free-will, during their earthly career, to have established themselves in a perfect, intimate, and untroubled union with God.† Those, how-

tam repente factum est corporis morte dissidium, ut et viventium et mortuorum animæ inter se nihil congruant, nihil communicent, omnis cognationis nobiscum et communis humanæ societatis oblitæ? Cum præsertim charitas, quæ præcipuum Spiritûs sancti in Christiano genere est donum: quæ nunquam non benigna, nunquam non fructuosa est, et in eo, in quo inest, nunquam inutiliter consistit, salva semper et efficax in utrâque vitâ permaneat.”—Jacob. Sadolet. Card. opp. tom. ii. p. 181.

* In the Missal, one of the prayers for the dead, runs thus: “Suscipe, Domine, preces nostras pro animâ famuli tui N. *ut si quæ ei maculæ de terrenis contagiis adhæserunt*, remissionis tuæ misericordiâ deleantur. Per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum.”

† In the Florentine formulary of reunion (which expresses the unity of belief of the Greek and Latin Church), it is said: “Item si vere

ever, admitted into the ranks of happy spirits, form, together with these, the Church triumphant—a denomination which sufficiently explains itself.

That the doctrine of an ulterior state of purification, of a purgatory in fine, is involved in the Catholic dogma of justification, and is absolutely inseparable from the same, we have already, in a former part of this work, demonstrated. We shall, accordingly, speak here only of the peculiar mode of communion, which is kept up between us and the poor souls, that are delivered over to the cleansing fire. We are taught, and are even urged by the strongest impulse of our hearts, to put up for them to God and Jesus Christ, our most earnest supplications. We present to God, more especially, the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, and beseech him, that for his Son's sake, he would look down with graciousness and compassion upon our suffering brothers and sisters, and deign to quicken their passage into eternal rest.* This custom, which we cannot ab-

pœnitentes in Dei caritate decesserint, antequam dignis pœnitentiæ fructibus de commissis satisfecerint et omissis, eorum animas pœnis purgatoriis post mortem purgari (καθαδικαῖς τιμωρίαις καθαίρεσθαι μετὰ θάνατον): et ut a pœnis hujusmodi releventur, prodesse eis fidelium vivorum suffragia, Missarum scilicet sacrificia, orationes, et eleemosynas, et alia pietatis officia, quæ a fidelibus pro aliis fidelibus fieri consueverunt, secundum ecclesiæ instituta Harduin." *Acta concil. tom. ix. p. 422.*

* Concil. Trid. Sess. xxv. decret. de Purgator. "Cum Catholica ecclesia docuerit, purgatorium esse: animasque ibi detentas fidelium suffragiis, potissimum vero acceptabili altaris sacrificio juvari, præcipit sancta synodus episcopis, ut sanam de Purgatorio doctrinam, a sanctis patribus et a sacris conciliis traditam, a Christi fidelibus credi, teneri, doceri, et ubique prædicari diligenter studeant. Apud rudem vero plebem difficiliore ac subtiliore quæstiones, quæ ad ædificationem non faciunt, et ex quibus nulla fit pietatis accessio, a

solutely abandon, for, we are impelled to its exercise, by all the power of faith and of love, is not only confirmed by the usages of the most ancient nations, and of the chosen people of God in particular, but may be proved to have been authorized by the practice of the primitive Church ; and is, accordingly, revered by us as an apostolic tradition. But, moreover, as to the mode of punishment, and the place, which purgatory occupies, the Church teaches nothing further ; for, she has, on this point, received no special revelations ; and when we use the expression, “purifying fire,” we employ it only in the usual figurative sense.

Of a different kind is the intercourse subsisting between us and the triumphant Church. Let us turn our view, more particularly, to those of its members, who were once incorporated with the Church on earth. Not only do they work among us by the sacred energies which, during their earthly pilgrimage, they displayed, and whereby they extended God’s kingdom, and founded it more deeply in the hearts of men ; energies, whose influence, acting at first on those within their immediate sphere, spread thence ever wider and wider, and will extend to all future times. Not only are they permanent models of Christian life, in whom the Saviour hath stamped his own image, in whom he, in a thousand ways, reflects himself, and in whom exhibiting to us patterns for all the relations of life ; he brings vividly before our view,

popularibus concionibus secludantur. Incerta item, vel quæ specie falsi laborant, evulgari ac tractari non permittant. Ea vero, quæ ad curiositatem quandam, aut superstitionem spectant, vel turpe lucrum spectant, tanquam scandala, et fidelium offendicula prohibeant,” etc. Sess. xxii. c. 11. “Quare non solum pro fidelium vivorum peccatis..... sed et pro defunctis in Christo nondum pleniter purgatis offertur.” Sess. vi. can. xxx.

the whole compass of virtues rendered possible through him. But, they also minister for us, (such is our firm and confident belief), in a still more exalted degree; and this their ministration requires from us a corresponding conduct. The purer their love, and the fuller their share in that ineffable bliss, whereof they have become partakers in Christ; the more they turn their affections towards us, and amid all our efforts and struggles, remain by no means passive spectators. They supplicate God in behalf of their brethren; and we in turn, conscious that the prayer of the righteous man availeth much with God, implore their intercession. The act, whereby we do this, is called invocation (*invocatio*); and that, wherein they respond to this call, is termed intercession (*intercessio*).*

The setting up of the saints by the Church, as patterns for religious and moral imitation, connected with the doctrine of their intercession in our behalf with God, and of the corresponding invocation of their aid on our parts, constitutes the principle of the veneration of saints, which is in the same way related to the supreme worship, as the mutual relation existing between

* Concil. Trid. Sess. xxv. "Mandat sancta synodus omnibus episcopis ut fideles diligenter instruant, docentes eos, Sanctos unà cum Christo regnantes, orationes suas pro hominibus offerre, bonum atque utile esse suppliciter eos vocare; et ob beneficia impetranda à Deo per filium ejus Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum, qui solus noster redemptor et salvator est, ad eorum orationes, opem auxiliumque confugere." Sess. xxii. c. 111. "Et quamvis in honorem et memoriam sanctorum nonnullas interdum missas ecclesia celebrare consueverit; non tamen illis sacrificium offerre docet, sed Deo soli, qui illos coronavit, unde nec sacerdos dicere solet, offero tibi sacrificium, Petre vel Paule, sed Deo de illorum victoriis gratias agens eorum patrocinia implorat, ut ipsi pro nobis intercedere dignentur in cœlis, quorum memoriam facimus in terris."

creatures, is to the state of dependence of them all on their common *Creator and Lord*. Virtuous creatures look with love and reverence on those of their body, who were eminently endowed by God, and, in virtue of the love implanted within them, they wish each other all good, and lift up their hands in each others' behalf unto God, who, rejoicing in the love that emanates from himself, and binds his creatures together, hears their mutual supplications, in case they be worthy of his favour, and out of the fulness of his power satisfies them ; and this no creature is able to accomplish. Moreover, if we are to worship Christ, we are forced to venerate his saints. Their brightness is nought else, than an irradiation from the glory of Christ, and a proof of his infinite power, who, out of dust and sin, is able to raise up eternal spirits of light. He who, therefore, revereth the saints, glorifieth Christ, from whose power they have sprung, and whose true divinity they attest. Hence the festivals of the Lord, whereby, the commemoration of the most important events in the Redeemer's history is, in the course of the year, with the most living solemnity renewed, the Church hath encircled with the feasts of the saints, who, through the whole progressive history of the Church, testify the fruitful effects of the coming of the Son of God into this world, of his ministry and his sufferings, his resurrection and the outpouring of the spirit ; so that, accordingly, in the lives of the saints, the effects of the life of Christ, and its undeniable fruits, are brought home at once to our contemplation, and to our feelings. And with reason may we say, that as God is no God of the dead, but of the living ; so Christ is no God of a generation, tarrying in the sleep of death, but of a people truly awakened in the spirit, and growing up to sanctification,

and to bliss. Lastly, it is to be borne in mind, that the doctrine of the Church does not declare, that the saints *must*, but only that they *can* be invoked; since the Council of Trent, in the passage we have cited, says, “only that it is *useful and salutary*, to invoke with confidence the intercession of the saints.” Of faith in the divinity of Christ, and in his mediatorial office, or in his sanctifying grace, and the like, the Church by no means teaches that it is merely useful and salutary, but that it is absolutely necessary to salvation.

§ LIII.—Doctrine of Protestants on this subject.

To these principles of the Catholic Church, Protestants oppose but mere empty negations, and a dead criticism. In the first place, as regards purgatory, Luther, at the outset, denied this doctrine, as little as that of prayers for the dead. But, as soon as he obtained a clear apprehension of his own theory of justification, he recognized the necessity of giving way here likewise to the spirit of negation. In the Smalcald Articles, composed by him, he expresses himself in the strongest manner against the doctrine of purgatory, and characterizes it as a diabolical invention.* Calvin also, with the most furious violence, declares against this dogma, and the symbolical writings of his party coincide with him on this subject.† At the same time,

* Artic. Smalcald. p. ii. c. 2. § 9. “Quapropter purgatorium, et quidquid ei solemnitatis, cultûs et quæstûs adhæret, mera diaboli larva est. Pugnat enim cum primo articulo, qui docet, Christum solum et non hominum opera, animas liberare.”

† Calvin. Instit. Lib. iii. c. 5. § 6. fol. 241. “Demus tamen illa omnia tolerari aliquantisper potuisse ut res non magni momenti, at ubi

with the clearest conviction, they avow the motive, which incited them on to this violent opposition; and disguise *not* the feeling, that the adoption, or even the toleration of the doctrine of purgatory, in their religious system, would admit a principle destructive to the whole. Reconciliation and forgiveness of sins, they allege, is to be sought for only in the blood of Christ. It would be, therefore, a denial of his merits, and of the rights of faith, which alone saveth, if it were to be maintained, that the believer in the other world had still to endure punishment, and were not unconditionally to be admitted into heaven.* The misconceptions, which these assertions betray, have been already pointed out elsewhere.

As regards the kingdom of saints made perfect, and our relation to them, the Lutheran opinions on this matter, stand in the closest connexion with their

peccatorum expiatio alibi, quam in Christi sanguine quæritur, ubi satisfactio alio transfertur, periculosissimum silentium. Clamandum ergo non modo vocis sed gutturi ac laterum contentione, purgatorium exitiale Satanæ esse commentum, quod Christi crucem evacuat, quod contumeliam Dei misericordiæ non ferendam irrogat, quod fidem nostram labefacit et evertit," etc. Confess. Helvet. i. art. xxvi. p. 86. "Quod autem quidam tradunt de igne purgatorio, fidei Christianæ: credo remissionem peccatorum et vitam æternam, purgationique plenæ per Christum adversatur."—Anglic. xxii. p. 134.

* The mere attention to the prayers of the Church, for instance, of the following prayer (in die obitus seu depositionis defuncti), might have shown to the Reformers the utter groundlessness of their reproaches. "*Deus, cui proprium est misereri semper et parcere*, te supplices exoramus pro anima famuli tui N. quam hodie de hoc sæculo migrare jussisti: ut non tradas eam in manus inimici, neque obliviscaris in finem; sed jubeas eam a sanctis angelis suscipi, et ad patriam paradisi perduci: *ut quia in te speravit et credidit*, non pœnas inferni sustineat, sed gaudia æterna possideat. Per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum."

doctrine on the Church, and are only a transfer of their maxims, respecting the ecclesiastical communion of believers in this world, to that of the next. They deny not the communion of believers in the Church militant; but, they reject the conditions, under which it can become real, living, and effectual. The believers indeed, stand all in a spiritual communion between each other, but we know not why: the whole doth not govern the individual—there is no mutual action between both, so that the member can well dispense with the body; the idea of communion remains completely idle, powerless, and ineffective. In the same manner, they question not the existence of a communion existing between us and the saints; but, they rest satisfied with the bare representation of it—a representation devoid of all truth; because it either hath no reality, or at best, but an imperfect one. The angels must be devils, and the saints wicked demons, if they could only be conceived to be in a state of cold, stiff indifference towards us; and their love of God would be idle in itself, did it not extend to rational creatures, equally susceptible of love, and were not active in our behalf. It was this idea which partly induced the German reformers not to offer a direct opposition to the Catholic doctrine.

In the first place, they concede that the lives of the saints are worthy of imitation, and that they should be honoured by our imitation. They even deny not that the saints pray for the Church at large, but they assert, that the saints must not be prayed to for their intercession.* The reason which they adduce, is the same that

* Confess. August. Art. xxi. “De cultû sanctorum docent, quod memoria sanctorum proponi potest, ut imitemur fidem eorum, et bona

brought about the dissolution of the ecclesiastical communion—namely, that Christ is our only Mediator! We must, however, examine the coherency of these ideas. It is indeed passing strange, that the saints should pray to God for us, without apprehending that they encroach on the mediatorial office of Christ; and God and Christ should even permit these, their functions, in our behalf, and, accordingly, find them free from all presumption: and yet, that we, on our parts, should not beseech the exercise of these kindly offices, because our prayer would involve an offence, whereas, the thing prayed for involves none. But the prayers of the saints must surely be termed culpable, if our requests, for such prayers, be culpable. But, should their supplications, in our behalf, be laudable and pleasing unto God; wherefore, should not the prayer for such supplications be so likewise? Accordingly, the consciousness of their active intercession necessarily determines an affirmation of the same on our part, and excites a joy, which, when we analyze it, already includes the interior wish and prayer for these their active aids. For, all communion is mutual, and to the exertions of one side, the counter-exertions of the other must correspond, and *vice versâ*. Certes, our indifference for the intercession of the saints would annihilate the same, and com-

opera juxta vocationem Sed Scriptura non docet invocare sanctos, seu petere auxilium à sanctis. Quia unum Christum proponit nobis mediatorem, propitiatorem, pontificem, et intercessorem." Apolog. ad Art. xxi. § 3-4. p. 201. "Præterea et hoc largimur, quod Angeli orent pro nobis. De Sanctis etsi concedimus, quod sicut vivi orant pro ecclesiâ universâ in genere, ita in cœlis orent pro ecclesiâ in genere.—Porro ut maxime pro ecclesiâ orent Sancti, tamen non sequitur, quod sint invocandi."

pletely destroy all communion existing between the two forms of the one Church. But, if it be impossible for us to be indifferent on this matter, then the doctrine of the Catholic Church remains unshaken.

The intercession of the saints, as well as the corresponding invocation of that intercession on our part, is so far from impairing the merits of Christ, that it is merely an effect of the same; a fruit of his all-atoning power, that again united heaven and earth. This our ecclesiastical prayers very beautifully and strikingly express; as they all, without exception, even such wherein we petition the benign influence of the celestial inhabitants on our earthly pilgrimage, are addressed in the Redeemer's name. Moreover, if the intercession of the saints interfere with the mediatorial office of Christ, then must all intercession, and prayer for intercession, even among the living, be absolutely rejected. It should be borne in mind, that Catholics say of no saint, he hath died for us; he hath purchased for us redemption in his blood, and hath sent down the Holy Spirit! But, by communion with Christ, all glorified through him, partake, as well in his righteousness, as in all things connected therewith; and *hence*, the power of their intercession; hence also, the right of petitioning for that intercession from the living, as well as from the departed just.

The opinions, which, according to Calvin's example, his disciples in France, and the Remonstrants in Holland, have formed on this matter, have the merit of entire consistency. They declare the idea of an intercession of saints for mortals, to be an absolute imposture and delusion of Satan, since, thereby, the right manner of praying is prevented, and the saints know nothing of

us, and are even quite unconcerned as to all that passes under the Sun.* From this point of view, in which it is imagined, that the saints resemble the Gods of the Epicureans, and live joyous and contented in heaven, without being, in the least, concerned about our insignificant actions, or suffering themselves to be thereby disturbed in their enjoyments, the prohibition to solicit the suffrage of the saints, is alone tenable. Such an idea of blessed spirits, as only the most obtuse selfishness could imagine, possesses certainly nothing to invite

* Confess. Gall. Art. xxiv. p. 119. "Quidquid homines de mortuorum sanctorum intercessione commenti sunt, nihil aliud esse, quam fraudem et fallacias Satanæ, ut homines a rectâ precandi formâ abduceret." Remonstrant. Conf. C. xvi. § 3. "Quippe de quibus (sanctis) Scriptura passim affirmat (!) quod res nostras ignorent, et ea, quæ sub sole fiunt, minime curent." A deeper view into the connexion of ideas, which induced the ancient Protestants to hold, here also, a negative course, is afforded us by Theodore Beza, who says of the veneration of saints, that it destroys the unity of God. In his epistle to Andrew Dudith, in order to dispel his doubts, that in the end Catholics might yet be right,—he observes, that these had not left a single article of religion unfalsified, and he continues: "Unum scilicet Deum reipsâ profitentur (verbo enim id eos profiteri ac etiam vociferari non inficior), qui quod unius Dei tam proprium est ac ἀκοινώνητον, atque est ipsa Deitas, ad quoscunque suos, quos vocant sanctos, transferunt."—See his Epist. theol. lib. i. Geneva, 1573, n. 1, p. 15. Certainly; for Catholics, doubtless, assert that the saints have helped God to create the world! In his writing on Divine Providence, Zuinglius, as we have in a former part of the work observed, adduces among other things, this argument against human freedom, that thereby a sort of polytheism would be introduced, and the true God set aside, since the notion of freedom involves independence, and therefore, every one, to whom free-will was attributed, would be converted into a God. The same argument is now alleged against the veneration of saints; whence we may also see, how closely are interlinked all the doctrines of Protestants.

to a friendly intercourse with them ; and God forbid, that in heaven a felicity should be reserved for us, to which the condition of any earthly being, in whose breast the spark of a loving sensibility is yet alive, would be infinitely to be preferred !

PART II.

THE SMALLER PROTESTANT SECTS.

§ LIV.—Introduction.

WE have, already, often had occasion to observe, that the principles of the German Reformation, were not on all points consistently carried out by the German Reformers; nay, that they frequently resisted, with their utmost energy, what comprised nothing more than a very natural inference from their own principles, or a continuance and developement of the views laid down by themselves. We here by no means allude to the so-called Rationalist theology, which, in modern times, has been often represented by Catholics as well as by Protestants, as a mere continuance and further prosecution of the work begun by Luther.* It is difficult to explain, how the notion could ever have obtained such easy, unqualified, and often implicit credence, that a doctrine, which denies the fall of the human race in

* We presume to suggest, that Catholic theologians, in asserting that the modern rationalism is a necessary consequence of the Reformation, mean not to deduce it from *all* the peculiar theological tenets professed by Luther and the first Reformers. They only, thereby, mean to assert, that the doctrine of the Supremacy of Reason in matters of religion proclaimed by Luther and other Reformers, more boldly and unequivocally than by all former heresiarchs, necessarily led to the introduction of rationalism. The doctrine of Private Judgment is the common parent of all, even the most discordant and opposite heresies.

Adam, is to be looked upon as a farther developement of that, which asserts, that in Adam we are all become incurable ; or that a system, which exalts human reason and freedom above all things, must be considered as an ulterior consequence of the doctrine, that human reason and freedom are a mere nothingness ; in short, that a system, which stands in the most pointed, general contradiction with another, should be admired as its consummation. Regarded from one point of view, the modern Protestant theology must be acknowledged to be the most complete reaction against the elder one. In the modern theology, Reason took a fearful vengeance for the total system of repression, practised upon her by the Reformers, and did the work of a most thorough destruction of all the opinions put forth by the latter. There is, however, it cannot be denied, another point of view from which the matter may be considered (see § 27) ; but this we must here pass over unnoticed.

When, accordingly, we speak of an incomplete developement of the principles of primitive Protestantism ; or, when we say that the consistent developement of the same was even rejected and assailed by the Reformers ; we advert to those doctrines, which could and must be deduced from their one-sided supernaturalism ; if we be justified in supposing, that a doctrine once put forth, being in itself pregnant and important, is sure to find some souls ready to devote themselves to it, with all their energy, and own its sway without reserve. The fundamental principle of the Reformers, was, that without any human co-operation, the Divine Spirit penetrates into the soul of the true Christian, and that the latter, in his relation to the former, is with respect to all religious feeling, thought, and will, perfectly passive. If this principle led the Reformers, in the first

instance only, to the rejection of Church authority and Tradition, and to the adoption of Scripture as the only source and rule of faith ; it must, when rigidly followed up, be turned against the position and the importance of Holy Writ in the Protestant system itself. Is written tradition not in itself a human mean for propagating doctrines and precepts ? For the understanding of the Bible, which has come down from ages long gone by, and from a people so utterly different from ourselves, is not very great human exertion requisite, such as the learning of languages, the study of antiquities, the investigation of history ? In what connexion, therefore, stands the proposition, that Scripture is the only source of faith, with the other proposition, that independently of all human co-operation, the Divine Spirit conducts to God ? If such an overruling influence of the Deity on man really exist, wherefore doth God still need Scripture and the outward word, in order to reveal His will to man ? In such a way, and by such an intermediate train of thought, men deduced, from the fundamental principle of the Reformation adverted to, the erroneous opinion, that independently of all human forms of communication, the Deity by immediate interior revelations, makes himself known to each individual, and in such a shape communicates his will to man. From which it follows, that Holy Writ itself must be held as a subordinate source of knowledge for the Divine decrees, or as one that may be entirely dispensed with. If the Christian Religion, by the severance of Scripture from the Church, had been already menaced with an utter absorption into mere individual opinions ; so now even the written Word, in the writings of the Evangelists and the Apostles, was no longer asserted to be the first and the only fountain of religious truth ;

and everything, accordingly, was given up to the most unlimited caprice. Returning from this its extremest point of developement, (though in an erroneous way), Protestantism passed into a formal system of visions. And this was effected by the instrumentality of Count Swedenborg, who believed himself elected by God, to hold a real intercourse with, and receive real instruction from, celestial spirits, who appeared to him in outward, locally determined forms, to enable him to oppose to vague, mere inward inspirations, and to subjective feelings, a fixed, outward, objective standard, and to prevent the complete dissolution and evaporation of all Christianity. In Swedenborg's system, accordingly, the one-sided mysticism became plastic, and false spiritualism took an outward, bodily shape, whereby the fantastic spirit of the Protestant sects was pushed to its farthest extreme; as subjectivity, striving after objectivity, became to itself an outward thing, in order to replace the external, visible Church founded by Christ. In other words, the mere impressions and feelings of the other Protestant sects, receive, through the plastic phantasy of Swedenborg, visible forms; about the same as if a man were to take for realities the images of his dreams!

The false spiritualism of these Protestant sects, to which every thing imparted from without appeared like death and petrification itself, directed its assaults more particularly against ecclesiastical institutions. And a distinct order of sacred ministry, even in the Lutheran and Calvinistic guise, it considered as an abomination, whereby the spirit was fettered; and the forms of outward worship, even the few which the Reformers had retained or new-modelled, it looked upon as heathenish idolatry. Thus grew up the conviction of the necessity

of reforming the Reformation itself, or rather of consummating it ; for this had not yet delivered the spirit from all outward works, nor brought it back to itself, to its own inmost sanctuary.

However, in more than one respect, these new-sprung sects approximated to the Catholic Church, from which they appeared to be still further removed, than even the Lutheran and the Calvinistic communities. It was almost always in the doctrine of justification, which, though they made use of unwonted forms of expression, they mostly conceived in the spirit of Christ's Church, this approximation was perceptible. They represented the inward, new life obtained by fellowship with Christ, as a true and real renovation of the whole man, as a true deliverance from sin, and not merely from the debt of sin ; and their feelings revolted at the doctrine of a mere imputed righteousness. Even in the Pietism of Spener, which receded the least from the formularies of the orthodox Protestantism, this tendency is manifest. There is no difficulty in discovering the connexion of this phenomenon with the ruling, fundamental principle of these sects. The stronger the sway of the Divine Spirit over the human heart, as asserted by them ; the less could they understand, how its cleansing fire would not consume and destroy all the dross of sin ; and hence, in the harshest terms, they often censured the Lutheran and Calvinistic doctrine of justification by faith alone, which they depicted as a carnal, nay, diabolic principle. This hostility appears most violent in Swedenborgianism, whose author, in conformity with the mode, in which he believed he arrived at the knowledge of all his doctrinal peculiarities, sees Calvin descend into hell, and finds Melancthon totally incapable of rising up to heaven ;

as in the proper place, we shall have occasion to recount this vision in connexion with his whole system. Hence, in fine, the very rigid ecclesiastical discipline, and the seriousness of life, which mostly characterize these sects ; hence, too, the maxim that even the visible Church should consist only of the pure and the holy ; a maxim, which connects them with the ancient Montanists, Novatians, and Donatists. With the ecstatic Montanists, especially, they have great affinity.

CHAPTER I.

THE ANABAPTISTS OR MENNONITES.

FIRST PERIOD OF THE ANABAPTISTS.

§ LV.—Fundamental principle of the Anabaptists.

THE Reformation had scarcely boasted an existence of five years, when, from the midst of its adherents, men arose, who declared it to be insufficient. Luther was at the castle of Wartburg, when from Zwickau, Nicholas Stork, Mark Thomas, Mark Stubner, Thomas Münzer, Martin Cellarius, and others, came to Wittenberg, to enter into a friendly conference with the theologians of that city. They spoke of revelations which had been imparted to them, without, however, at first exciting attention, by any singularity of opinion, save the rejection of infant baptism. Writers have occasionally expressed their astonishment, how the above-named men, (two only of whom possessed any tincture of learning, the rest belonging to the class of workmen) were able to bestow reflection upon the subject adverted to, which had not then been agitated. This phenomenon, however, can only then afford matter for surprise, when we would call in question the active intercourse between these men and the Reformers of Wittenberg—an intercourse which it is vain to deny; for when Melancthon conversed with them about their faith, he found it in exact conformity with that of the new Saxon school. And why should Luther's maxims and writings not have reached their ears, more especially as the leading

preacher at Zwickau, was among the number of his confidants? If such be the case, then nothing is easier than to account for their rejection of infant baptism. Luther having, as we observed in a former place, connected the efficacy of the sacraments with faith only, it is not possible to understand why infants should be baptized: and from the Reformers' point of view, it was not difficult for any one to discover the utter want of an adequate ground for this ecclesiastical rite. From Melanchthon's inclination to recognize the gossellers of Zwickau, as well as from the embarrassment Luther experienced in refuting their arguments, without totally abandoning his theory, respecting the mode of sacramental efficacy, men might long ago have inferred the close affinity between the Anabaptists and the Saxon Reformers, and should utterly have disregarded the pretence of any extraction from the Vaudois.

Undeniable as is the original affinity, between the Anabaptists and the Lutherans, yet, this affinity soon changed into a mutual opposition the most decided. An indescribable confusion prevailed in the minds of the new sectaries, and a fearful fanaticism drove them on to every species of extravagance and violence; and as they had the inmost conviction of doing all things by the impulse of the Divine Spirit, all hope of opposing their errors by rational instruction was utterly fruitless.* Müncer was deeply implicated in the war of the peasants; and the very tragic history of Münster, must have, at last, opened the eyes of the most indulgent

* Melanchthon's History of Thomas Müncer. (In German.) Luther's works, ed. Wittenberg, part ii. p. 473. "Hereby he imparted to these doctrines an illusive appearance;—he pretended he had received a revelation from heaven, and taught nothing else, commanded nothing else, but what God had approved."

and impartial observer. From this time forward, especially, the Anabaptists encountered every where the most determined adversaries; and hundreds in their community, under Catholics as well as Protestants, had to forfeit their lives for their principles.

In unfolding to view the doctrines of the Anabaptists, we may rightly assign the most prominent place to their Millenarian expectations. After foretelling the utter extirpation of all the ungodly, they announced the kingdom of Christ as immediately thereupon to be established on earth. A new, perfect life, in common among Christians, would then be founded, which was to subsist without external laws, and without magistracy; for, in all its members the moral law written on every man's heart would revive, and be powerfully exhibited in life. Even Holy Writ would be abolished; for, the perfect children of God no longer need the same (and its contents would be no longer an outward object, but rather the inmost portion of their being.) Then perfect equality among all would be established; and every thing would be in common, without any individual calling any thing his property, or laying claim to any privilege. Wars and hostilities of every kind would cease to exist. Even marriage would no longer be contracted, and without marrying or giving in marriage, "some pure and holy fruit would yet be produced, without any sinful lust and wicked desire of the flesh."*

Thus it was an ideal state of the Christian Church, that floated before the imagination of the Anabaptists—the confused representation of a joyful kingdom of

* Justus Menius's "Doctrine of the Anabaptists refuted from Holy Writ," with a preface by Luther: included in the works of the latter, Wittenberg, ed. part ii. p. 309, b. (In German.)

holy and blessed spirits, which inspired these sectaries with such deep enthusiasm, gave them such power and constancy of endurance under all persecutions, and caused them to exert on all sides so contagious an influence.* The more exalted, pure, and innocent, the vital principle of the sect appeared, the more easily could its adherents inflame the souls of their contemporaries. We cannot refuse to these fanatics an infantine originality in their view of human society ; and the impetuous desire after a complete realization of the idea of God's kingdom—the impatient haste which prevented them from awaiting the developement of time, and with which they panted for a sudden irruption of the relations of the next world into the present,—a sudden unveiling of that state, that only in the course of ages could be gradually revealed, announces something magnanimous, and rejoices the heart amid all the aberrations we encounter in their history, and which were quite inevitable. In fact, they, in part at least, only anticipated a future state of things ; and all they strove to realize, was not the mere invention of an unbridled phantasy. Social life rests on a spiritual and bodily community of goods ; all the thought and reflection—all the learning and knowledge of the individual become the common property of the social body, to which he belongs ; and whatever he acquires for himself, he acquires ultimately for others also. For, an indomitable propensity to communicate his acquirements

* Melancthon's History of Thomas Münceer, loc. cit. p. 474. " With such idle talk he made the populace gape ; then people ran to him, and every one desired to hear something new ; for, as Homer says, " The new song is ever the favourite with the populace ! " How could Melancthon thus speak against the Anabaptists ! As if the song which *he* sung, were an old one !

is inherent in every man ; and we think we know nothing, if our knowledge be not for the benefit of those, with whom we live. Whoever hath brought forth some original idea, is urged by a mysterious inward impulse to submit it to the judgment of intelligent men ; for, the peculiar constitution of our intellectual nature, will not permit us to trust our own thoughts, if they meet not with approval. There is, perhaps, no other more certain criterion of madness, than the clinging to some idea, which every one holds to be a mere idle fancy. In a word, all men form, as it were, but one man ; and herein, among other things, consists the truth in the Neo-Platonic doctrine of an universal soul ;—a doctrine by which the followers of that philosophy even sought to explain the sympathy existing between men. But if a man will have his thoughts and ideas recognized, he must of necessity communicate them to others.

In the Catholic Church, this idea of the community of spiritual life is most fully expressed ; since, in what regards *religion*, the individual submits all his productions to the judgment of the whole body, and foregoes the pleasure of having discovered any truth, if his lucubrations be considered, by the community, as containing aught inconsistent with its fundamental principles.

It is nearly the same with corporeal goods. Man enters into civil society, not only with the view of securing his property by the union into which he has entered, but also with the resolution of sacrificing it, in case of necessity, to the exigencies of the commonweal. What are hospitals, poor-houses, infirmaries ; what are all public establishments for education and instruction, but a special reflection of the idea of the community of goods among all ? The greater the progress which social life, under the influence of Christianity, makes,

and the greater in consequence the civilization of the human race; the more do special associations for special objects arise, wherein a multitude of members go security for the individual, in order to guarantee and insure his earthly existence. Insurance establishments become ever more numerous, and more comprehensive in their objects; and these also, we hold to be ever more significant expressions of the idea of a community of goods,—an idea, indeed, which, like all others, can never be completely realized in this finite life. Who doth not here, too, recall to mind the first Christian community of Jerusalem? The consummation of the Christian period will doubtless, though in a freer and milder form, lead us back to the state of its primitive age. Moreover, we here stand on ethical ground; for external existence possesses value only as it is the expression of inward life, and the work of spontaneous resolution. But the Anabaptists wished to realize at once and *by violence*, one of the highest moral ideas; and this is ever impossible. Nay, they wished to introduce it among men such as they are, who, by their entire education, are as unsusceptible, as they are unworthy, of such an idea, and they made its introduction into life the prop for their own indolence, yea, for every possible wickedness. The greater the contradictions, accordingly, between the idea of the Anabaptists and the reality of life, the more the difficulties increased, when they wished to realize that idea in society. The more undoubted, amid all these obstacles, their belief in their own divine mission; the more infuriated must they become, and the more convulsive must be all their efforts. Hence, in the first Anabaptists we discern, beside the simplicity of the child, the fury of the wildest demagogue; who, to create a holy and happy world,

destroyed in the most unholy and calamitous manner, the actual one; and, as a blind instrument, ministered to the ambition, the avarice, and all the basest passions of the reprobate men, whom we so frequently meet with, in the early history of the sect.*

§ LVI.—Initiation into the Sect. Signs and confirmation of covenant.

The Anabaptists believed themselves authorized, by an injunction from above, to prepare the way on earth, for the approaching establishment of the above-described perfect kingdom of God. They travelled about, accordingly, in every direction, to announce the liberty

* The idea of the absolute community of goods is far more ancient than Plato's Republic, and all the institutions of his time, which he might, perhaps, have had in view. When the golden age, the period of Saturn's rule, was to be portrayed; when the Goddess Justitia, (who is something far more than the idea of the *suum cuique*) still dwelt on the earth; the poet connects the words:

“Nondum vesanos rabies nudaverat enses,
Nec consanguineis (such all men are) fuerat discordia nata,
Flumina jam lactis, jam flumina nectaris ibant,
With *Ne signare quidem, aut partiri limite campum.*”

Even the freedom allotted to slaves during the Saturnalia, called to mind the original absence of all distinction among men. But the happy period ceased, since “deseruit propere terras justissima virgo.” Plato, as well as Aratus, Macrobius, and others, drew from the same cycle of sagas. It is worthy of remark, that the idea of the absolute community of goods appears, almost always, connected with that of community of wives. Such is the case in Plato, in Epiphanes, the son of Carpocrates, and very clearly among the Anabaptists, and the elder Gnostic sects; and when the latter are so frequently charged with the *libido promiscua*, this accusation ought not, as often happens, to be so slightly called in question. Hence, also it follows, that an absolute community of goods, would annihilate the whole civilization of the human race: because it is incompatible with the existence of marriage and the family: domestic life absolutely presupposes property.

of God's children, and to make a preliminary election of all those, whom the Lord would use as instruments for the rooting out of all tares, and the extirpation of all the ungodly. The community about to be gathered together by them, was to consist exclusively of saints, and typically to represent, in every way, the celestial Church, which was expected. Hence, all who wished to be taken into the new community, were baptized anew ; for, they had before received only the powerless, watery baptism of John ; whereas, they now would be cleansed with Christ's baptism of fire and of the Spirit. By this baptism, they understood the real regeneration of the spirit out of the Spirit—the complete surrender of the whole man unto God—the disengagement of the will from all creatures—the renunciation of every attempt to wish to be any thing in one-self—lastly, the being filled with power from above. This notion of the effects of baptism is essentially the same, as the Catholic Church has ever set forth. And it was partly the perception, that so many rest satisfied with the mere outward work, and confound the water with the Spirit, and the bodily ablution with the internal purification of the soul ; and partly, the guilty and wilful ignorance, that such a conceit was condemned by the Church itself, which could have persuaded the Anabaptists, that their doctrine on baptism was a new revelation from God. At all events, we clearly see, from this fact, that some lofty idea animated and impelled them.

According to the baptismal formula of Hans Denk, every candidate renounced seven evil spirits ; namely, man's fear, man's wisdom, man's understanding, man's art, man's counsel, man's strength, and man's ungodliness, and in return received fear of God, wisdom of God, and so forth. Melchior Rink made use of the

following formula:—"Art thou a Christian? Yes.—What dost thou believe, then? I believe in God, my Lord Jesus Christ.—For what wilt thou give me thy works?—I will give them for a penny.—For what wilt thou give me thy goods; for a penny also? No.—For what wilt thou give then thy life; for a penny also? No.—So then thou seest, thou art as yet no Christian, for thou hast not yet the right faith, and art not resigned, but art yet too much attached to creatures and to thyself; therefore thou art not rightly baptized in Christ's baptism with the Holy Spirit, but art only baptized with water in John's baptism."

"But if thou wilt be saved, then thou must truly renounce and give up all thy works, and all creatures, and lastly, thy own self, and must believe in God alone.* But now I ask thee, dost thou renounce creatures? Yes.—I ask thee again, dost thou renounce thy own self?—Yes.—Dost thou believe in God alone? Yes.—Then I baptize thee in the name," etc.† This action, the Anabaptists called the sealing and the sign of the covenant.

It must here, however, be observed, that these sectaries by no means connected with the outward act the communication of the Holy Spirit. On the contrary, they accurately distinguished between both, as Calvin from the same motives afterwards did; and they regarded the exterior act in baptism, only as the symbol of suffering in general, and of the mortification of wicked lusts in particular.‡ The members of this sect,

* From these maxims it is clear, that the justifying faith held by the Anabaptists, was the *fides formata* of the Catholic Church.

† Justus Menius, loc. cit. p. 309, b.

‡ Philip Melanchthon's Instruction against the Anabaptists, in Luther's works. Part ii. p. 292, ed. Wittenberg, 1551. (In German.)

moreover, did not baptize their new-born children, as not understanding the signification of this holy act; and they administered the sacred rite to them only on their attaining to riper years. Hence, the name of "Anabaptists," is characteristic of the proceedings of the sect only in reference to its initiation of strangers, but by no means denotes their principles in relation to their own members; as they never twice baptized those of their own body, who were to be initiated into their Church.

Of the holy eucharist, the Anabaptists taught, in like manner, that it has only a figurative signification. "Eating and drinking in common," said they, is throughout the whole world a sign of mutual love: the same holds good of "the supper" of Christians. As wine, moreover, is extracted from the grape only by the wine-press; so, they taught, it is only by the pressure of sufferings, the Christian is prepared for the kingdom of God, and the felicity it insures. The corn must first be ground, before it can be converted into bread; so man must first be ground down by misfortune, before he can be qualified for entering into the kingdom of heaven. So we see, that baptism, and the eucharist, were, in their estimation, rites pre-eminently figurative, denoting the necessity of sufferings, and of unshaken constancy under persecution. Their very afflicted condition, forced these sectaries to look out every where for a source of solace and of fortitude under their trials;

"Baptism is a sign that Christians in the world must let themselves be oppressed, and bear and suffer every kind of danger and persecution. This is signified by the outpouring of water upon them." Compare p. 299. "In the third place, baptism is a covenant, exclaim the Anabaptists, whereby man engages to mortify his wicked lusts, and to lead a rigid life, and exercise patience under sufferings; but this infants do not yet understand or practise."

and therefore, in the above-named sacraments, they saw only the properties, whereof they stood in such especial need. Hence, whosoever among them felt himself at any moment, not sufficiently strong to stand the combat courageously, was exhorted to abstain from communion; for it was more particularly fear and despondency, which they loved to set forth as those sins, whereby a man “eateth and drinketh judgment to himself.”*

§ LVII.—These sectaries assail the Protestant doctrine of Justification.

With peculiar bitterness did these sectarians declare themselves against the Lutheran doctrine of Justification, and in this respect, almost come round to the Catholic point of view. Their notion, respecting the justifying faith of Protestants, is very well expressed in the following passage, from the work of the Lutheran Justus Menius:—“They mightily boast,” says he, “they have in their doctrine the true power of God, and that our’s is an idle, weak, unfruitful husk; that we can do nothing more than cry out, faith, faith alone; but this cry remaineth, in every respect, an idle and dead cry.” It strikes us, at the first glance, that it was only to faith, as united with good works, that the Anabaptists ascribed the power of justification: whereas, however, according to the above-cited formula of baptism, they declared themselves ready to give up their works for a penny. This is, however, only a coarse expression for the great truth, that the Christian should ever think humbly of himself, and not be proud of his moral en-

* Melancthon, *Instruction*, loc. cit. p. 292. Justus Menius, loc. cit. p. 339.

deavours—it is only a condemnation of the deadliest foe to all Christian piety—to wit, arrogance and confidence in one's own works. The following reasoning of Justus Menius against the Anabaptists, will set this matter in the clearest light; while, at the same time it is of importance, as determining the notion, which the Lutherans attached to justification by faith alone. He says,—“The fanatics cannot here get out of this difficulty; though they often repeat, that we are not to put faith in the merit of works and sufferings; yet, they insist, that we ought to have them, however, as things necessary to salvation. *That is nonsense, for if works be necessary to salvation, then we cannot certainly obtain salvation without them, and then consequently, faith alone doth not save; but that is false.*”

This memorable passage, in a writing which Luther accompanied with a preface, by no means signifies that the principle, whereby salvation is obtained, consists in faith, and not in the works to be wrought besides; but that faith, even when it should not produce the fruit of good works, yet insures salvation. The Pastor of Eisenach will also discover a contradiction in the doctrine, that, on one hand, works are necessary to salvation; and, on the other hand, that the Christian should not attach importance to the same. But here the self-same objection recurs, which the Lutheran theology also raised against the Catholic doctrine of justification, to wit, that it leads to self-righteousness, and obscures the glory of God. Menius observes, “Only see how consistent is their system: *man, they say, must renounce his own works, and yet they contend and urge, with all their might, that he must have, together with faith, works also, or he will not be saved.* But what is the meaning of this? Works are necessary to salvation;

and yet he, who will be saved, must renounce his works. Ergo, he, who will be saved, must himself renounce what is necessary to salvation, and without which he cannot be saved. Make this tally,* rebel! Remember, that *mendacem oportet esse memorem*, that is, he who will lie, ought to have a good memory; otherwise, when in what he afterwards says, he will contradict himself, people will observe, how he hath lied in what he had before spoken; this should make the lying spirit more heedful.”†

The theology of the good Justus Menius, finds the inculcation of good works, absolutely incompatible with the idea of humility. And, accordingly, he thinks the doctrine, that we must “renounce” such works—that is to say, acknowledge ourselves useless servants, even when we have done all, to be perfectly irreconcilable with the other tenet, that works are a necessary condition to salvation. Whereupon, in his opinion, there remains no other alternative, than to believe, that faith, even without ever evincing its efficacy in works, can render us acceptable to God!

§ LVIII.—Continuation. Concurrence of the most various errors in the sect.

Among the Anabaptists, considered as a sect, we discover not other doctrinal peculiarities, though we find a considerable multitude of errors professed by individuals, or even larger parties among them. Justus Menius had learned, that even original sin was denied

* In the German, the word *bundschuh* (a buckled shoe) is used; this Menius employs as a term of reproach, because such was painted on the banners of the rebellious peasants under Müncer.

† Justus Menius, loc. cit. p. 319-20.

by the Anabaptists ; probably, it would seem, to give a broader basis to their doctrine, respecting the unlawfulness of infant baptism. On this subject, they were wont to appeal to the language and conduct, which the Saviour, on several occasions, had manifested in respect to children. From a misunderstanding, they attached especial importance to the text, wherein children are held up by him as models for adults, if they would enter into the kingdom of heaven.* That, however, only a few of the Anabaptists rejected the doctrine of original sin, although Justus Menius charges, without restriction, the whole body with such a denial, is evident from the fact of another accusation being preferred against them ; to wit, that they held the body of Christ to have been created by the Holy Spirit, and merely fostered in the womb of the Blessed Virgin ; so that, thereby, the Saviour would not have taken flesh and blood from Mary. They feared that, in conceding more, they would have been unable to uphold the sinlessness of Christ. Whereas, this error is not even conceivable, except on the supposition of original sin ; the kindred doctrine above adverted to, respecting the peculiar, sinless sort of generation to take place in Christ's future kingdom on earth, necessarily involved also a belief in an evil transmitted by the present mode of sexual intercourse. And, indeed, that violent antagonism between the human and the divine, which runs through the whole doctrinal system of these sectaries, were not possible, without the conviction of a deep-rooted corruption tainting humanity in all its relations. Moreover, the doctrine in question, respecting the conception of Christ, appears to have obtained a very wide currency among the

* Justus Menius, loc. cit. p. 332.

Anabaptists :—at least, very many adversaries take the trouble of refuting it.* The greater the multitude, who gave in to this error, the smaller must be the number of those, who, to assail infant baptism, denied original sin.

Many Anabaptists rejected the doctrine of Christ's divinity : others taught an ultimate restoration of all things—the ἀποκατάστασις πάντων, and in consequence, the final conversion of Satan ; others again, that souls, from the moment of death, sleep until the day of judgment. Even an antinomian tendency was discernible in some individuals among them. These, like the "brothers and sisters of the free spirit,"† and like

* Melanchthon : Propositions against the doctrine of the Anabaptists. loc. cit. p. 282, b. ; Urbanus Regius, *ibid.* p. 402-18 ; Justus Menius, p. 342. "The reader may also consult in the same volume of Luther's works, the dialogues between the Hessian theologians Corvinus and Rymæus, and John of Leyden, Krechtingk, and others, p. 453. It is clear, moreover, from this, that the Protestant Church historian, Schröckh, has fallen into an error, in representing this doctrine of Christ's conception as a peculiarity of Menno : for, it was taught in the sect, long before Menno joined it.

† "The brothers and sisters of the Free Spirit," were a fanatical sect of Pantheists, that sprung up in the early part of the thirteenth century. They probably owed their origin to the philosophical school, which Amalrich, of Bena, and David, of Dinant, had founded, and which was, in the year 1209, condemned by a synod at Paris, whose sentence was confirmed by the pope. They derived their name from the abuse they made of the texts of Scripture in Romans viii. 2-14 ; and in St. John iv. 23, asserting that "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, had freed them from the law of sin ;" "that, being led by the Spirit of God, they had become the sons of God." Professing a mystical Pantheism, they held, like the Paulicians, that every thing is an immediate emanation from the Deity, referring to themselves the words of Christ, "I and the Father are one." Whoever attained to their view, belonged no longer to the world of sense (abusing, as they did, the words in John viii. 23, "I am not of this world ;") he could

the “libertines,”* asserted that no one, who had once received the Spirit, could any longer sin in any work whatsoever; and that therefore, for them, adultery even was no sin; and Zwingle refers by name to a member of the sect, who had announced this to him, as his personal conviction. For a time, also, the opinion that polygamy is not forbidden to Christians, was very general amongst them.†

no longer be contaminated by it, and therefore he no longer needed the sacraments. Separating body and mind, they maintained that all sensual debaucheries could not affect the latter; and hence, some among them abandoned themselves without scruple to the grossest vices. In Swabia, particularly, about the middle of the thirteenth century, they went about inciting monks and nuns to abandon their rules, and suffer themselves to be led entirely by God and the “Free Spirit.” Severe measures were then taken against them.

The Apostolicals, a sect founded by Segarelli, of Parma, towards the close of the same century, held tenets very similar to those just described.—*Trans.*

* The “Libertines” were a sect of fanatical Pantheists, that sprang out of the general religious ferment of the sixteenth century. They first appeared in Flanders, in the year 1547, and thence spread into Holland, France, and Geneva, where they gave Calvin much annoyance. At Rouen, a Franciscan monk, who had imbibed the tenets of Calvinism, was the first to inculcate the abominable doctrines of the new sect.—*Trans.*

† On the denial of Christ’s Divinity, see Justus Menius, loc. cit. p. 342; and Zwingle’s Elenchus contra Catabapt. Op. tom. ii. fol. 39. “This account is perfectly credible, as we know of Lewis Hetzer, for instance, that he was at once an Unitarian and an Anabaptist; and at a later period, as is well known, an Unitarian congregation was formed in Poland, which professed likewise Anabaptist principles. On the opinions which the Anabaptists entertained respecting the ἀποκατάστασις, or final restoration of things, compare Justus Menius, p. 343; and Zwingle’s Elenchus, loc. cit. p. 38, b. The sleep of souls after death is there also attested, p. 37, b. For the antinomianism of the Anabaptists, see *ibid.* fol. 16. On the polygamy of John of Leyden, and the defence set up for the same, see Luther’s works, part ii. p. 455, ed. Wittenberg. Here we find recorded the above-mentioned dialogue,

These opinions, however, should not be considered as strictly Anabaptist ; for, in part, they were in direct

held by the Hessian theologians, Antonius Corvinus, and John Kymæus, with John of Leyden, and Krechtingk, from which I will take the liberty of extracting the following passage, in order to show at once the extremely meagre and mean view the ancient Lutherans entertained respecting marriage, and the straits, into which, by their rejection of tradition, they were necessarily driven. After several questions and answers, wherein, especially, the Old Testament polygamy was discussed, King John of Leyden, in defence of his plurality of wives, observed :—"Paul says of a bishop, he should be the man of one wife. If now a bishop should be the man of one wife, it follows that in the time of St. Paul, it was permitted for a man to have two or three wives, according to his pleasure." The Lutheran preachers replied :—" *We have before said, that marriage belongs to civil policy, and is a res politica ; but as the civil policy, on this matter, is now very different from what it was in the time of St. Paul, and as it has forbidden, and will not tolerate the plurality of wives, you cannot answer for such an innovation, either before God or man.*" To this King John :—"Yet I have the hope, that what was permitted to the fathers, will not damn us ; and I will in this case rather hold with the fathers, than with you ; still less allow, that I profess therein any error, or unchristian innovation." The Lutheran preachers :—"We would in this case much rather obey the civil power, because it is ordained of God, *and in such external matters*, hath the right to command and to forbid, than recur to the examples of the fathers ; as for such a course we have not a warrant in God's word, but, on the contrary, know truly, that the Scripture countenances our opinion respecting marriage, rather than your view. For instance, the Scripture saith, "Therefore shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave unto his wife." Here we are told, a man shall cleave unto his wife, and not unto many wives. And St. Paul saith, "Let each man have his own wife." He saith not, "Let each man have many wives." King John : "It is true, St. Paul here doth not speak of all the wives in general, but of each wife in particular : for the first is my wife, I cleave to her ; the second is my helpmate, I cleave to her likewise, and so on. Thus, the Scripture remains intact in all its dignity, and is not opposed to our opinion. And wherefore should I waste many words ? "It is better for me to have many wives, than many strumpets." The king finally proposed

opposition to other maxims of the sect. It is, on the contrary, to be presumed, that at the commencement, amid the general religious ferment of the age, a multitude of men joined the Anabaptists, without having any thing akin to them, save a dark fanaticism and confusion of ideas. But in general, the remark holds good, that the first Anabaptists had neither a compact system of theology, nor any body of doctrines, however ill-connected, which all uniformly professed. If we consider, that their sect had not originated in one man, as the common centre of all; and that the leading idea, round which all revolved, though powerful enough to inspire enthusiasm, was yet, in a doctrinal point of view, unproductive; if we consider, moreover, that the dark feelings, by which all were animated and impelled, had not received a definite expression in any public formulary—a circumstance which gave occasion to a general complaint, on the part of their adversaries;* we shall feel the less surprise at the fact above-mentioned.

to leave to the tribunal of God, the judgment on this matter. Here we discover the origin of the desire, subsequently expressed by Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, to have two wives—a desire which Luther and Melancthon, together with Bucer, however reluctantly, complied with.

* Justus Menius, “Spirit of the Anabaptists;” loc. cit. p. 363. “If they taught only the right doctrines, they would not prowl about so secretly in the dark, nor their preachers lurk in holes and corners.” See also Zwingle in several passages of his cited work, *Elenchus*. Also, “Doctrine of the Anabaptists refuted from Holy Writ,” loc. cit. p. 311.

§ LIX.—Continuation. Relation of Scripture to the inward spirit.
The Church.

It will be still more easy to conceive the confusion of doctrines, in this sect, if we direct our attention more particularly to the opinions which they entertained, respecting the office of preaching, and also what was immediately connected with this, the relation of Scripture to the inward motions of the free, living Spirit. It was a principle, with this sect, that every one marked and sealed with the sign of the covenant, was not only able, but was also bound to appear as a prophet and teacher, as soon as he felt himself moved by the Divine Spirit, and perceived he was favoured with a revelation. To these inspirations Holy Writ was made in such a degree subordinate, that the Anabaptists did not long strive to bring them into an even apparent conformity with Scripture, but declared the Bible to be in its present form absolutely falsified.* Hereby every standard, for the regulation of subjective opinions, was rejected; the entire system of Christianity was severed from all external historical basis, and abandoned to the stormy fluctuations of a dreaming fancy. With such errors no

* Justus Menius "On the spirit of the Anabaptists," p. 364. "For it is undeniable, that Thomas Münzer, and after him his disciple Melchior Rink, together with many other disciples, had no regard at all for Holy Writ, called it a mere dead letter, and clung to special new revelations of the Spirit: nay, they dared even openly give the lie to Scripture, as I myself heard from the lips of Rink, who had the effrontery to say, that all the books of the New Testament in every language, Greek, Latin, German, etc. were altogether false, and that there was no longer a genuine copy on earth." Hereupon follows a special application of this principle to the passage in Matthew xxvi. 28, where the words, "which shall be shed for many for the remission of sins," were, according to this doctor, inserted by the devil.

distinct order of preachers was at all compatible ; for, without settled doctrines, such an institution involves a self-contradiction. Hence also, the Anabaptists strained their utmost efforts to subvert the Protestant preachers, to prevent the consolidation of the new, and (in their opinion) too material Church, which depended on these ministers ; and then to convert it into a purely spiritual institution.*

If some years previously, the Lutherans had urged against the Catholic clergy the ever-recurring reproach, that instead of the doctrine of the Bible, they preached up only the ordinances of the Church ; so they, in their turn, were now blamed for fettering the living Spirit to a dead word of Scripture, and not allowing men to follow the fresh, pure, untroubled impulse from above ; “and like the Jewish scribes, they were declared to have no Holy Ghost, but to be only conversant with Scripture, and to chase their weariness away with its perusal.”† On the other hand, the Lutherans prove against the Anabaptists, what, as coming from the Catholics, they would never themselves assent to ; they point out to them the establishment of an apostleship by Christ himself, and draw, from this institution, nearly the same conclusions as the Catholics themselves. They allege, with laudable industry, Scriptural texts, whereby

* Calvin (*instructio adv. Anabapt. opusc. p. 485,*) accuses them of only asserting, that there should be no fixed teachers appointed to any particular place, but that all, like the apostles, should be itinerant preachers. But then he adds : “*Hæc porro philosophia inde manabat, quod serio cuperent, fideles ministros sibi cedere, vacuumque locum sinere, quo liberius venenum suum ubique effundere possent.*”

† Justus Menius, *Doctrine of Anabapt. refuted, etc. p. 310-13.* On the spirit of the Anabapt. p. 364, b. “In short, it is well known and not to be denied, that the Anabaptists have no more injurious appellation for any one, than to call him a Scribe.”

the Holy Ghost had instituted teachers, prophets, and administrators, and the disciples of our Lord had appointed bishops and elders, in order that the one, true and pure doctrine might be preserved unfalsified ; and they repeatedly enjoin, that teachers, though chosen by men, are yet ordained by the Holy Ghost.* This assertion Melanchthon approved even so far, as to hold orders to be a sacrament. He says, in his Instruction against the Anabaptists : “That priestly orders should be placed in the number of the sacraments, affords me much satisfaction. Yet so, that by orders be understood the calling to the office of preaching, and of administration of the sacraments, and so the office considered in itself. For it is very necessary, that in Christian Churches, the function of preachers should be regarded and esteemed as something most precious, venerable, and holy ; and that people be instructed, that it is by the hearing of sermons, and the reading of God’s Word, and Holy Writ, God will impart the Holy Spirit, *to the end, that no one may seek, out of the regular ministry, for any other revelation and illumination, such as the Anabaptists pretend to.*”† The Lutherans were so unkind, as to torment the poor fanatics with questions, which, to this day, they have been unable to answer themselves. They asked the Anabaptists, who had sent them ? and as they could show no ordinary mission, where were the miracles whereby they authenticated their extraordinary mission ? The Anabaptists, with reason, retorted the same questions upon them.‡

* Justus Menius, Refutation of doctrine of Anabapt. p. 312, b. ; Spirit of the Anabapt. p. 358, b ; Melanchthon, Instruction against Anabapt. p. 294.

† Melanchthon’s Instruction, etc. loc. cit. p. 294.

‡ Zwingli Elenchus, loc. cit. fol. 29 ; Menius Anabapt. refuted, loc.

Luther had once said, "whoever is so firmly convinced of the doctrine he announces, that he can, without hesitation, curse the opposite view, furnishes in that case a proof of the verity of his opinions." In this sort of demonstration, the Anabaptists certainly far surpassed all, who lived and flourished in their time.

§ LX.—Hatred against all outward institutions for promoting edification.—Ecclesiastical discipline.—Manners and customs.

To the ideas, which the Anabaptists had formed respecting the Church, corresponded their views as to the accidental parts of outward worship, and the arrangements having reference to the same. If Carlstadt, in Wittenberg, and Zwingle, in Zurich, had broken down images and altars, and the latter even had destroyed organs, the Anabaptists, on their part, declared the bared and despoiled temples to be still idol-houses.* Of singing, they entertained nearly the same opinion, as in former ages Peter de Bruys, who held it to be a worship of Satan. Had their loquacity not been too great, they would, doubtless, have looked down upon the manifestation of the Christian spirit in words, as something too outward and too material; and hereby alone would they have acted with perfect consistency.

As regards their ecclesiastical discipline and their peculiar customs, they perfectly bear the impress of the ruling principle of the sect. The idea of the community of goods, though this was to be completely realized only after the advent of Christ, was in the language at

cit. p. 311. "Also, how will they prove, that they have been sent by Christ to gather together the elect, and to seal them? They work no signs, to enable us to discern this mission with certainty."

* Menius, Spirit of the Anabaptists, loc. cit. p. 354

least of the community provisionally applied ; and, even prior to the establishment of the millennium, a sort of proximate application of this principle was to be attempted among those, who, in the meantime, professed the doctrines of the sect. The authority which we have already often cited, says among other things : “ They have neither father nor mother, brother nor sister, wife nor children in the flesh, but are mere spiritual brethren and sisters among one another. Each one says, I am not in mine, but in *our* house, I lie not in mine, but in *our* bed, I clothe myself not with mine, but with *our* coat. It is not I and Kate *my* wife, but I and Kate *our* sister keep house together. In short, no one has any thing more of his own, but every thing belongs to us the brethren and sisters.”*

They rigidly maintained excommunication, for, no unholy one was to be in the Church of God.† Their prohibition against assuming any function of magistracy, was in close connexion with this persuasion. Rulers there were to be none, and universal freedom and equality were to prevail in all the relations of life. But it is observable, that we not only find attributed to them the doctrine, that the ministers of the gospel should alone be invested with civil authority—a proof that magistracy was not wholly despised—but, we see this doctrine carried out into practice. We see, moreover, laymen also at the head of their political govern-

* Menius, Doctrine of Anabapt. refuted, loc. cit. p. 309, b.

† Calvin Instruct. adv. Anabapt. opuscul. p. 476. “ Usus excommunicationis,” said the Anabaptists, “ inter omnes esse debet, qui se Christianos profitentur. Qui baptizati noxam aliquam imprudenter aut casu admittunt, non ex industrâ, si secreto moneri debent semel atque iterum : tertio publice coram toto cœtu exterminandi sunt. Ut possimus eodem zelo una panem frangere, et calicem bibere.”

ment. We need only remind the reader of Thomas Münzer in Orlamünde, and Mühlhausen, as also of John of Leyden in Münster, who even called himself king. These facts stand in twofold contradiction with the doctrines of the Anabaptists—first, with their principle, that the office of teaching is common to all Christians; secondly, with their just alleged prohibition against undertaking any function of civil power. These facts, moreover, are easily explained by the utter impossibility of their realizing such theories in life.

Furthermore, that the Anabaptists should not allow the sword to be wielded, and accordingly, should hold all warfare to be unlawful, was a principle that immediately followed from the fundamental tenet of the sect. Yet again, we are not astonished, when we see them so often, in despite of their principles, with arms in their hands, and hear them vociferate the fearful cry against all princes, nobles and proprietors; “Strike Pinkebank on the anvil of Nimrod.” Lastly, they declared all oaths to be illicit; and in fact among perfect Christians, such as the new kingdom to be erected by them presupposed, no oaths need ever be taken.*

§ LXI.—The Anabaptists in the form of Mennonites;—their second period.

With that bold confidence, which is wont to characterize fanatics, the Anabaptists had announced the near approach of the thoroughly holy kingdom of God on earth. But day after day, they saw themselves de-

* Melancthon, “Refutation of some unchristian doctrines put forward by the Anabaptists,” loc. cit. p. 285. Joannes Calvinus, loc. cit. p. 493.

ceived in their expectations, so that they at last renounced the chimerical hope. They had not even succeeded in uniting the portion of Christians the most important, if not in number, yet in internal energy, nor in bringing about, as preparatory to Christ's coming, the total abolition of all civil magistracy, and the establishment of a holy theocracy. Nay, they encountered such a mighty opposition, that the most credulous were soon obliged to look upon the hopes they had fondly cherished, even in this respect, as idle and vain. Hereby vanished that idea, which had been the inmost, vital principle of the sect, and which had constituted all its importance; and with it accordingly, it lost all historical interest. Its members became more modest and more tranquil, and more reconciled with the social relations. But as the high, practical object of their existence had been given up, and a real doctrinal interest they had never possessed; the Anabaptists, by degrees, directed the energies, that still survived their first mighty excitement, to the settlement and regulation of the most insignificant relations of outward life, falling into the most whimsical contests on these matters, and, thereby, exhibiting a striking contrast to their earlier history, where all the attempts at reformation had been conducted on a grand scale. As this second crisis of their existence was approaching, its introduction was accelerated by means of a Catholic priest, Menno Simonis, curate of Wittmarsum, near Franeker in Friesland, who, in the year 1536, went over to the Anabaptists;* and who possessed so little intellect and literary culture, as to join a party,† whose vital object was allowed to

* Hermanni Schyn, *historiæ Mennonitarum plenior deductio*. Amstelodami, 1729, c. v. p. 116.

† Loc. cit. p. 138, we find a letter of Menno Simonis, wherein he

be vain, and yet enough of these qualities to pass among his fellow-religionists for a very distinguished personage. He possessed, moreover, a very pious, energetic zeal, and a certain degree of moderation (which, however, was never evinced towards Catholics); so that, by the confidence he had won, he was enabled to appease the contests of the Anabaptists, to unite them together, and to regulate their social relations. They took their name from him, and have since been usually called Mennonites. He died in the year 1561.

It is worthy of remark, that the Mennonites call in question their descent from the earlier Anabaptists. When the first intoxication of fanaticism was over, they forgot all they had perpetrated under its influence; and what they heard recounted of themselves, they conceived to regard some other community. Sometimes they deduce their origin from the first Christians;* sometimes they assert, that quite independently of all outward impulse, Menno Simonis had arrived at his peculiar opinions through the exclusive study of Holy Writ;† and sometimes again, they allege, that among

says, he had written his treatise on baptism in German, “nam Latine incitiae causâ non bene possem.”

* The good Schyn, in his *Historiæ Mennonitarum plenior Deductio*, c. i. Amst. 1729. “Ex primis Christianis, qui ex institutione Domini nostri Jesu Christi exemplisque Apostolorum, per omnia Christiana sæcula in hunc usque diem inter cætera dogmata adulatorum baptismum docuerunt, et adhuc docent, descendisse (Mennonitas.)” *Immediately* thereupon, it is said: “Inter hos sæculo undecimo (rather duodecimo) emicuerunt Waldenses.” What a leap from the first to the twelfth century!

† Schyn (*loc. cit.* p. 135) observes, after citing the account which Menno Simonis had given of his going forth out of Babylon,—“Evidentissime constant, ipsum solâ sacræ Scripturæ lectione, meditatione, et illuminatione Spiritus Sancti ex Papatû exivisse.” But from

the first Anabaptists of the sixteenth century, there were men of a calm and moderate tone of thinking, from whom they were themselves the descendants; and this assertion is not entirely devoid of foundation.*

§ LXII.—Peculiar doctrines of the Mennonites. Their Church-discipline.

From the later Symbolical writings of the Anabaptists, it is at the first sight evident, who were their progenitors. We shall now proceed to give the main substance of these Confessions, taking as our standard the Confession of Waterland,† composed in the year 1580, by John Ries and Lubbert Gerardi, Mennonite preachers; without however, leaving the other unnoticed. After enlarging first on God, the Trinity, and the incarnation of the Logos, the Confession comes to the doctrine of the Fall, and says, that the first man, by his transgression of the Divine precept, had incurred the anger of God, yet had been again strengthened by consoling promises, in consequence whereof, none of his descendants are born with the debt of sin, or of penalty.‡ This, in itself, very obscure proposition, de-

the very narrative of Menno adduced by Schyn himself, it appears, that the former, even when a Catholic priest, had been in connexion with the Anabaptists, though he condemned the extravagances of the Münster fanatics.

* Schyn *Historia Mennon*. p. 263-5: here he appeals with justice to some favourable testimonies of Erasmus.

† This Confession is found in Schyn *Hist. Menn.* c. vii. p. 172. See, in *Hist. Menn.* c. iv. p. 78, the historical notices on this Confession.

‡ Art. iv. p. 175. “Eousque ut nemo posterorum ipsius respectu hujus restitutionis aut peccati aut culpæ reus nascatur.” The fourth formulary of the united Frieslanders and Germans, which is likewise

rives from the following doctrines some degree of light. It might be explained, as if the Mennonites denied original sin. But their opinion is rather, that a sinfulness is transmitted from Adam to all his descendants; but that it is attended with no debt; since this is remitted by God's grace. In the fifth article, an explanation is given respecting the faculties, which man in his fallen state still possesses; and it is taught with great propriety, that in the same way as Adam, before his fall, had the power of giving or of refusing admittance to the spirit of evil into his soul: so after the fall, he still has the power of perceiving the Divine influences, and accordingly of receiving or rejecting the same;* and this doctrine other formularies express to the effect, that fallen man still possesses free-will.† Hence it is clear, that the Mennonites considered those born of Adam, to be subject to corruption, and as such, to be incapable of producing and executing anything acceptable to God; yet still they believed them to be possessed of free-will. In consequence of this opinion, they declare themselves explicitly against an absolute grace of election: they even devote a special article to the doctrine of Providence, and combat the Calvinistic opinion, that God worketh evil.

After confessing, moreover, the vicarious atonement of Christ, they declare, in terms the most clear and un-

tolerably full, says in Article iii. "*per eam (inobedientiam) sibi omnibusque suis posteris mortem consciviti, atque ita ex præstantissimâ misserrima factus est creatura.*"—See Hist. Menn. p. 90.

* Art. v. p. 176, "*Eidem jam lapso et perverso inerat facultas occurrens et a Deo oblatum bonum audiendi, admittendi, aut rejiciendi.*"

† The fourth Formulary of the united Frieslanders and Germans, Art. iv. p. 90. "*Dominum æque post ac ante lapsum liberam homini reliquisse voluntatem acceptandi vel rejiciendi gratiam oblatam,*" etc.

equivocal, that saving faith is that which “worketh by charity,” and that through the same is righteousness acquired.* Righteousness they describe as forgiveness of sins, on account of Christ’s blood, and accordingly, as a transformation of the whole man; so that, from a wicked, carnal, avaricious and arrogant man, he becometh a good, spiritual, generous and humble one; in a word, that from an unrighteous he becometh a righteous man.† What they now inculcate respecting good works, follows as a matter of course. They even teach that the life of the righteous and regenerated man should be in perfect correspondency with the Divine law; if, on his part, he anxiously looks forward to the future *rewards* so graciously promised.‡

Of such righteous and regenerated men, the Church, according to them, exclusively consists.§ In this hath Christ appointed a teaching ministry; for although every believer be a member of Christ, he is not on that account a bishop, priest, or deacon; for the body of Christ, the Church, consists of various members. More-

* Art. xx. de verâ fide salvificâ. “Omnibus bonis et beneficiis, quæ Jesus Christus, per merita sua, ad peccatorum salutem acquisivit, fruimur gratiose per veram et vivam fidem, quæ per charitatem operatur.” The third symbolical writing of the united Frieslanders and Germans called the “Olive Branch,” says: “Hinc patet, fundamentale certumque filiorum Dei criterium et Jesu Christi membrorum esse veram et salvificam fidem per charitatem operantem.”

† Art. xxi. “Per vivam ejusmodi fidem acquirimus veram justitiam, id est, condonationem sive remissionem omnium tam præteritorum quam præsentium peccatorum, propter sanguinem effusum Jesu Christi, ut et veram justitiam, quæ per Jesum, cooperante Spiritû sancto, abundanter in nos effunditur vel infunditur (let the reader here mark the adoption of Catholic phraseology); adeo ut ex malis, carnalibus, avaris, superbis fiamus boni, spirituales, liberales, humiles, atque ita ex injustis, reverâ justî.”

‡ Art. xxiii.

§ Art. xxiv.

over, the ministers of the word, though called and elected by the ministers of the same, must be confirmed through imposition of hands on the part of the elders.* Lastly, they must set forth only what coincides with the written word in the Old and New Testament.

Christ, according to them, hath instituted only two sacraments to be administered by the teachers. The sacraments are outward, sensible acts, whereby is represented an inward, divine act, that transforms, justifies, spiritually nourishes and sustains man ; while the person receiving the sacrament testifies thereby his religion, his faith, his penitence, and his obedience, and binds himself to the observance of the latter. Here, however, we must remark that in this system, neither by baptism, nor by the Lord's supper, for these are the two sacraments of the Mennonites, is that divine power communicated, which purifies, renovates, and nourishes the spirit of man. They merely typify what perpetually occurs through the power, which from Christ and his spirit eternally streams down on all believers, and only symbolize this constant action of the Deity. The Mennonites, moreover, baptize only adults, as these alone are capable of faith and penitence. That their doctrine, respecting original sin, renders infant baptism, in their opinion, unnecessary, is clear from what has been above stated.† Lastly, Menno Simonis adopted the washing the feet of the travelling brethren as an indispensable ceremony ; and the confession of the united Frieslanders and Germans expressly upholds it, and makes mention of it after the article of baptism.‡

* Art. xxv.—xxviii. See also formulary of the united Frieslanders and Germans, Art. x. p. 98.

† Art. xxx.—xxxv.

‡ Art. xiii. p. 101.

On impenitent sinners, excommunication, after some brotherly exhortations, is rigidly enforced.*

Obedience to the civil power is enjoined as a religious duty ; yet, singular enough, it is asserted that the exercise of all functions of magistracy is unbecoming to the true Christian (*aut male aut plane non convenire*) ; and that, on this account, he should forbear undertaking offices of this kind. The motive assigned is, that Christ instituted no civil authority, and still less did he command his apostles to assume the functions of magistracy. On the contrary, they were invited by him to imitate his defenceless life, and to carry his cross, whereby certainly nothing of earthly grandeur, secular power, or the right of the sword was indicated. Moreover, princes and public functionaries are under the obligation of waging war, of marching against enemies, and depriving them of property and life ; but all this is forbidden to the Christian.† Finally, the Mennonites absolutely proscribe all oaths ; and, in almost all their confessions, declare against polygamy.‡

§ LXIII.—Conclusion. Special controversies.

It is beyond all doubt, as is clear from the preceding statement, that the Mennonites in several articles of doctrine differ considerably from the first Anabaptists, and that they have thrown off their more fanatical tenets. The direct revelations from Heaven, communicated to each individual, have here ceased ; and we find established a distinct order of ministers, bound by the written word. The violent introduction of God's kingdom upon earth, associated with the annihilation of the established

* Art. xxxv. xxxvi.

† Art. xxxvii.

‡ Art. xxxviii.

order of society, and of the rights of property, has given way to the formation of a new inward life, and to a concomitant willingness to assist the indigent according to ability, and to share every thing with them in Christian love, without an external community of goods being required. By the setting forth of a common system of doctrines, moreover, very unchristian and demoralizing tenets have been excluded. But in other respects, we clearly discern in the Mennonite only the purified Anabaptist. In the view, especially, entertained respecting the civil power, we see the glimmering of that earlier fanaticism, that would fain have doomed it to utter destruction, as totally unsuitable to the Christian. In the prohibition, likewise, to engage in war, and to take oaths, we see ever shadowed forth that ideal kingdom of Christ, which through the mediation of the Anabaptists, was to confer a sudden felicity on the world.

Yet the establishment of a definite system of doctrines, already adverted to, must be so understood only in a very limited sense. This will be apparent from what follows, wherein the opposition between the inhabitants of Waterland and the united Frieslanders and Germans, to which allusion has been made, will be more closely examined.

The Mennonites, likewise, soon broke up into different parties; but as the sect had lost all high importance, most of the controversies that sprang up in its bosom, were utterly insignificant. They divided into the subtle, and the gross party. Those, who rigidly adhered to the ancient rule of manners, received the former epithet; the latter was given to those, who allowed themselves various mitigations of the rule. The latter are called from the district in Holland, which they inhabit, Waterlanders; the former Flemings and Frieslanders. The

gross Mennonites soon became by far the most numerous ; while the subtle ones disputed among themselves on the questions, whether or not a Mennonite may acquire by purchase a house ; whether it be also lawful for him to clothe himself in fine linen, if he wished truly to evince the austere spirit of the sect. These and the like differences fall not within the scope of our enquiries ; though the first mentioned controversy, as a remnant of the doctrine of the community of goods, and of the prohibition to hold property, is deserving of attention, and coincides with the fact, that the rigid Anabaptists frequently wish to be nothing more than mere farmers of lands.

The Ukevallists, called after a preacher of Friesland, who maintained the proposition, that Judas and the high-priests, who condemned Christ, as they only executed the divine decrees, have been admitted to salvation, can here only receive a passing notice. More important are the differences on the question, whether or not an individual, whatever may be his doctrinal views—should he even be a Socinian—can be received as a member of the community, or can be permanently so considered ? This question was connected with that respecting the value and importance of public formularies, to which the Mennonites on the whole, though at different times they published several confessions, were never very favourably disposed. Those, who declared for absolute freedom, were called Remonstrants, and also Galenists, from their leader, a physician of that name at Amsterdam. Their opponents, the Apostools, were likewise called after a physician in their communion of that name, who resided at Amsterdam. But in proportion, as the Mennonites unreflectingly opened a door to foreign influences, their old respectable, though

often pedantic, earnestness, and the religious hallow of life by degrees declined. Or rather is not this phenomenon—this aversion to a settled, definite system of doctrine—a remnant of that one-sided practical tendency, which characterized the sect in its very origin; and in pursuance of which it tolerated in its bosom the most various, and the most opposite views on the most important dogmas of faith? The original spirit, accordingly, would here have only returned.

So much respecting the Mennonites or Anabaptists. With them the *Baptists* are not to be confounded. Such are those Puritans in England named, who with respect to infant baptism hold opinions similar to those of the Mennonites, without, however, being on other points distinguishable from the English Calvinists of that party. From the year 1633 they have formed a separate community.

CHAPTER II.

THE QUAKERS.

§ LXIV.—Some historical preliminary remarks.

WHOEVER would undertake the task of tracing historically the gradual developement of Protestant Sectarianism, should after the Anabaptists treat of the Schwenkfeldians, who though they appeared only a few years later than the former, yet, as exaggerated spiritualists, stand considerably higher. He would next have to describe some individual enthusiasts, as well as larger communities of this description, that made their appearance in the latter half of the sixteenth, and the former half of the seventeenth century; and then only could he turn to the quakers, who went to the farthest verge of the boldest spiritualism, and were to be outdone only by contradictions. Among the first Anabaptists, the effort of a false spiritualism took quite an eccentric course, and the pure spiritual life, which they would fain have introduced, rested on the expectation of an extraordinary, marvellous introduction of a higher order of things into this lower world. All the ordinary relations of earthly life were menaced with destruction, and that delicate, subtle kingdom of the spirit, which they aimed at, was in manifold ways troubled by a very gross political spirit; for earthly bonds cannot be, without violence, suddenly dissevered, nor, at once, replaced by supermundanities. This spiritual kingdom was founded in a very carnal manner, and the means proved destructive to

the end. The supersensual principle, also, even where it had attained, in this sect, to any consolidation, was not presented in its purity and integrity ; since the sacrament was retained, not as the channel and conductor, but merely as the emblem of divine graces. Moreover, among the doctrines of this sect, there were some which mere accident had annexed to its stem, or which at least had not naturally grown out of its root.

Far more developed appears the spiritualism of Schwenkfeld, whose peculiarities, however, we shall not be able to point out ; as no remains of his sect have survived down to our days. But in its most complete form doth this false spiritualism manifest itself, as we before said, among the Quakers, who honour as their founder George Fox, a shoe-maker and shepherd, born at Drayton in Leicestershire in the year 1624, and who departed this life in the year 1690. Among the Quakers we discover an interior piety, which, when we can succeed in forgetting, now and then, the utter perverseness of the whole system, marvellously cheers and refreshes, and even, at times, deeply moves the mind, though not, by any means, in the same degree as our own better mysticism. Moreover, we find among them a conscious and firm prosecution of the point of view they have once adopted—a consistency extremely pleasing and cheering, which flinches from no consequences, and has given to Quakerism such an advantage over the orthodox Protestantism, where the most crying dissonances are to be found. All parts stand in the most harmonious proportion with each other, forming a fine connected whole, whose architectural perfection leaves little to be desired ; and to the Catholic, especially, who is forced by his own religious system to look every where for internal keeping and consistency, appears entitled to respect.

Consistency is not indeed, truth itself, and doth not even supply its place ; but a system of doctrine is ever false, which includes parts inconsistent with the whole. In George Fox, the founder of the sect, we doubtless do not find this internal harmony of system, nor the transparent clearness of doctrine determined thereby ; but that the system was capable of attaining to this harmony, lay in the very nature of the fundamental idea, out of which it sprang. A very remarkable and amiable trait of Quakerism is that avoidance of every kind of asperity, which so frequently shocks us in the orthodox Protestantism. The manner, too, wherein the Quakers treat all the better phenomena of religion and morality in the times anterior to Christianity, evinces great tenderness of feeling ; nor is this less manifest in their rejection of the Calvinistic doctrine of absolute predestination. Here, also, the Quaker strives to emulate the Catholic ; but the capital error of Quakerism is, that though in itself a fair, deeply conceived and harmonious system, it stands in the most direct opposition to historical Christianity, and as far as in it lies, annihilates the same ; for this the following exposition of its principles will clearly show. This task we will now undertake, taking for our guide the *Apology* by Barclay—the most celebrated writer among the Quakers, and whose book enjoys an almost symbolical authority ; for, they have not put forth a regular confession of faith.*

* *Roberti Barclai Theologiæ vere Christianæ Apologia*, edit. sec., Lond. 1729. With Barclay, however, we shall always compare the following work, entitled : “A portraiture of Quakerism, taken from a view of the moral education, discipline, peculiar customs, religious principles of the society of friends.” By Thomas Clarkson, Esq., in three vols., 3rd edit. Lond. 1807. The author was, for a long time, in habits of intercourse with the Quakers ; and finding them vigorous

Before, however, we make our readers acquainted with the system of this remarkable religious community, we must lay before them the motives, which induced its first propagators to establish a peculiar sect. Like many other religious parties, in the deeply convulsed age of Cromwell, they particularly missed in the High Church of England, the free expansion of the spirit of piety—religious life, and interior warmth, and unction. Every thing in this Church appeared to them torpid and petrified. The Divine Spirit, which heretofore had filled the Church, was denied, and out of the living congregation had been banished, and confined to the dead word of Scripture; and the boast of the Reformers, that this dead word would infallibly shed a heavenly light over its readers, and enkindle them with a holy fire, was refuted by every day's experience. The established worship appeared void and meaningless in the eyes of the Quakers, and seemed to consist of nothing more than a dry, cheerless repetition of forms and hymns, composed though they were in the vernacular tongue. And in fact, when the real presence of the Saviour had been rejected, and the sacrifice been abolished, nothing more remained, which directly and by itself could fill the susceptible soul with devotion and sacred awe, or exalt, solace and bless it. The act was bereaved of its very soul; it became an earthly thing, and though rational, yet unspiritual and uninspiring. All now depended on the fact, whether the preacher were able to draw words of life from the inmost core of a soul, filled with the Divine Spirit, and were enabled to edify by a

opponents to the slave-trade, to the suppression whereof Clarkson devoted all his energies, he came to entertain a great affection for them. This book must be used with caution.

heavenly power the assembled believers, and by the combined animation, clearness, and depth of his discourses to initiate them more and more in the mysteries of Christ's kingdom. But it was here precisely, the longings of the Quakers were most cruelly deceived; so that not unfrequently they would interrupt the sermons of the Anglican ministers, and in their revolted feelings would bid "the man of wood" descend from the pulpit. Even the most spiritual-minded preacher is not master of celestial unction and illumination;—days and weeks of internal dryness and desolation will occur;—and no human art can supply the gift from above. The majority of preachers, alas! abound neither in divine nor human energy;—others possess not even the will; and thus it cannot fail to happen, that the greater part of sermons attain not by one-half their end, and very many fall even far short of it. This the Quakers deeply felt; and in default of an act in the public worship, which by its intrinsic worth could seize possession of the soul, they rejected the whole established service, as an institution incapable of satisfying the higher wants of the religious man. To this we must add the numberless disputes, which then convulsed the Anglican Church. Opinions crowded upon opinions, each seeking its foundation in Holy Writ; yet not one being able to prove by that standard its own truth, or the untenableness of the opposite systems; and no living human authority, invested with a divine sanction, was anywhere recognized. It appeared to the Quakers, that the truths of Christianity were in imminent danger; and that, if they had no other support than Holy Writ, they must perish in the struggle of parties. Thus they receded from every external institution—not only from the Church and public worship, but, in a great degree, from

Scripture itself; and, for what they held to be vital truths of salvation, they sought an indestructible basis in the *immediate* inspiration of a creative, inward light, which, *without any other medium*, was to be, if not the exclusive, yet the principal source of nurture to the spirit.

§ LXV.—Religious system of the Quakers. The Inward Light.

While avoiding all explanation as to the nature of the Paradisaic man,* the Quakers hold, that from the fallen Adam, a germ of death, a seed of sin, has been scattered over all his posterity; for the word “original sin” they will not employ, nor indeed any other technical expression unsanctioned by the usage of Scripture. Hereby, all men were entirely bereaved of the Divine image, which, however, the Quakers do not particularize; and this bereavement, according to them, must be understood by the menaced death, which they thus conceive to have been only spiritual.† So long, however, as the

* Barclaii Apolog. theolog. Christ. p. 70. “Curiosas illas notiones, quas plerique docent, de statû Adæ ante lapsum, prætereo,” &c.

† L. c. “Hæc mors non fuit externa, seu dissolutio exterioris hominis; nam quoad hanc non mortuus est, nisi multos post annos. Ita oportet esse mortem quoad spiritualem vitam et communionem cum Deo.” A valid conclusion forsooth! What a betrayal, too, of ignorance in philology! On all this Clarkson furnishes us with more details. Of the consequences which Adam’s sin produced first in him, and then in all his posterity, Clarkson says as follows: “In the same manner as distemper occasions animal life to droop, and to lose its powers, and finally to cease; so unrighteousness, or his rebellion against this Divine light of the Spirit, that was within him, occasioned a dissolution of his Spiritual feelings and perceptions; for he became dead, as it were, in consequence, as to any knowledge of God, or enjoyment of His presence.” See the above-cited work, p. 115.

universal seed of death, through a conscious and active culture of the same, beareth no fruits; it constitutes, they continue, no guilt, and therefore by no means entails damnation. On this account, unconscious infants were not subject to eternal punishment.*

In a very remarkable way do these sectaries represent the work of the atonement after Adam's fall. God doth not merely promise a future Redeemer:—He not only guideth the general and particular destinies of individuals and nations, in order to prepare them for the great day of the incarnate Deity;—He doth not merely vouchsafe to raise up among all nations wise men, teachers of their contemporaries in word and deed, great law-givers and rulers. No! from the Logos himself, who personally appeareth in the centre of history, and for the sake of his merits, a creative vital principle emanates through all ages, as from the centre of a circle the rays are emitted to every point of the circumference; so that the breath of Christ's Spirit blows forward and backward, and leaveth no one untouched. To this they

* Barclaius, p. 70. "Quod Deus hoc malum infantibus non imputat, donec se illi actualiter peccando jungant, &c." The whole is thus summed up in p. 80. "Confitemur igitur, semen peccati ab Adamo ad omnes homines transmitti (licet nemini imputatum, donec peccando sese illi actualiter jungat), in quo semine omnibus occasionem peccandi præbuit, et origo omnium malarum actionum, et cogitationum in cordibus hominum est; ἐφ' ᾧ, nempe δαύαρ, (ut v. ad Rom. habet): i. e. in quâ morte omnes peccavere. Hoc enim peccati semen frequenter in Scripturâ mors dicitur, et corpus mortiferum, quum re verâ mors sit ad vitam justitiæ et sanctitatis; ideoque hoc semen, et quod ex eo fit, dicitur homo vetus, vetus Adam, in quo omnes peccant. Proinde hoc nomine ad significandum peccatum illud utimur, et non originali peccato, cujus phrasis in Scripturâ nulla fit mentio, et sub quâ excogitata, et ut hoc verbo utar, inscripturali barbarismo, hæc peccati infantibus imputatio inter Christianos intrusa est."

refer the passage in St. John's Gospel: "He is the true Light, which enlighteneth every man, that cometh into the world."*

We must not here think of St. Justin's σπέρμα τοῦ λόγου, (seed of the Logos) λόγον σπέρμα τικόν; for, by this is understood the germ of rationality, the image of God, the copy of the Logos in every man—in one word, the higher nature of man himself. But, under the aforesaid light, which emanates from Christ to every member of the human race, the Quakers understand a divine energy, to be superadded only to man's higher nature.†

Around this vital principle, dispensed by Christ, the eternal friend of man, and pervading the human race, through all the extent of space and of time, revolve all the thoughts and feelings of the Quakers;—to this is all piety and devotional awe referred, and hence, we must make ourselves particularly acquainted with the description, which they give of it. They apply to it various denominations, such as "spiritual, celestial, and invisible principle and organ, wherein the Father, Son, and Spirit dwell; the body and the blood of Christ, wherewith all the saints are nourished to eternal life;" "the internal light," on which account the Quakers are called the Friends of Light, or simply Friends—(a title

* Barclaius p. 126. "Hic locus nobis ita favet, ut a quibusdam Quakerorum textus nuncupetur; luculenter enim nostram propositionem demonstrat, ut vix vel consequentiâ vel deductione egeat."

† Clarkson in the above-cited work, p. 117, differs from Barclay. According to the former, "God did not entirely cease from bestowing His Spirit upon Adam's posterity." According to the latter, Christianity is quite a new manifestation of grace on God's part, in order to regenerate man; "a new visitation of life, the object of which was to restore men, through Jesus Christ, to their original innocence or condition."

which is the most gratifying to them)—“the inward Christ,” “the seed of Christ,” “grace,” “internal revelation,” and so forth.*

From the lips of the Quakers, these words ever resounded ; but the Anglicans would by no means understand them. Barclay bitterly complains of this, and says, that while formerly those only were held to be Christians, who, as St. Paul (in Romans viii. 9) teacheth, had “the Spirit of Christ,” or, as he expresses himself in the same place (viii. 14), “those only are the sons of God, who are led by the Spirit of God ;” no one now any longer recognizes the sovereign necessity of

* Loc. cit. p. 106. “Hoc semine, gratiâ, verbo Dei et lumine, quo unumquemque illuminari dicimus, ejusque mensuram aliquam habere in ordine ad salutem, et quod hominis pertinaciâ et voluntatis ejus malignitate resisti, extingui, vulnerari, premi, occidi et crucifigi potest, minime intelligimus propriam essentiam et naturam Dei in se præcise sumtam, quæ in partes et mensuras non est divisibilis sed intelligimus spirituale, cæleste, et invisibile principium et organum, in quo Deus, ut est Pater, Filius et Spiritus, habitat ; cujus divinæ et gloriosæ vitæ mensura omnibus inest, sicut semen, quod ex naturâ suâ omnes ad bonum invitat et inclinât, et hoc vocamus vehiculum Dei, spirituale Christi corpus, carnem et sanguinem Christi, quæ ex cœlo venere, et de quibus omnes sancti comedunt, et nutriuntur in vitam æternam. Et sicut contra omnia facta mala hoc lumen et semen testatur, ita ab eis etiam crucifigitur, extinguitur, et occiditur ; et à malo fugit et abhorret, quod naturæ suæ noxium et contrarium est. Et quum hoc nunquam separetur à Deo et Christo, sed ubi est, ibi etiam Deus et Christus est in illo involutus et velatus : eo igitur respectû, ubi illi resistitur, Deus dicitur resisti et deprimi et Christus crucifigi et occidi, et sicut etiam recipitur in corde, et effectum suum naturalem et proprium producere non impeditur, Christus formatur et suscitatur in corde Hic est Christus ille internus, de quo nos tantum et tam sæpe loqui et declarare audimur, ubique prædicantes illum, et omnes hortantes, ut in lumen credant, illique obediant, ut Christum in semet-ipsis natum et exsuscitatum noscant, ab omni peccato illos liberantem.”

this possession by the Spirit.* It was objected to the Quakers, that they held man to be of a divine essence, or every individual to be Christ. Others again interpreted their language, as signifying by the inward light, merely the conscience, the reason, or the religious feeling of man. All these allegations they denied, in replying that the principle in question is not the essence of the Deity itself, but an energy and an organ of God; whereby divine life, as from a grain of seed, is expanded in man. They added, they did not even compare themselves with Christ, as in him the Godhead dwelt bodily; but they stood in the same relation to him, as the vine-branch to the vine-stem, which diffuses vigour through every part. Lastly, the inward light, they said, is not a human faculty, since in quality it is distinct from the nature of man.† The real cause of these mistakes, we shall point out below.

§ LXVI.—Continuation of the same subject. Effects of the inward Light.

We now proceed to describe the workings of this inward light. Every man hath a day of visitation, (*diem visitationis*)‡ on which God graciously approacheth to

* Loc. cit. p. 4.

† Loc. cit. p. 107-8.

‡ Loc. cit. p. 102. "Primo quod Deus, qui ex infinito suo amore filium suum in mundum misit, qui pro omnibus mortem gustavit, *unique*, sive Judæo, sive Gentili, sive Turcæ, sive Scythæ, sive Indo, sive Barbaro certum diem et visitationis tempus dederit, quo die et tempore possibile est illis servari et beneficii Christi mortis participes fieri. Secundo, quod in cum finem Deus communicaverit et *unique* homini dederit mensuram quandam luminis filii sui, mensuram gratiæ, seu manifestationem Spiritûs Tertio, quod Deus per hoc lumen et semen invitet omnes, et singulos vocet, sed et arguat, et hortetur illos, cumque illis quasi disceptet in ordine ad salutem."

him, and will awaken and enlighten him, in order to form Christ within his soul. From this no one is excepted, but yet no one is forced; (for predestination there is none, nor irresistibly working grace.)* The instrument which God employs for this end, is the inward revelation, which, without any sort of medium—without outward words or signs, endeavours to implant moral and religious ideas in the soul of man, and hath sufficient power to make them living.† This inward light, our authority continues to say, all the ancient philosophers and teachers of nations attest—this all the higher efforts, which we meet with in universal history, avouch (*revelatio objectiva.*)

This inward word, whereby God speaketh to every

* Barclay says of Calvin's doctrine, p. 84: "Quam maxime Deo injuriosa est, quia illum peccati authorem efficit, quo nihil naturæ suæ magis contrarium esse potest. Fateor hujus doctrinæ affirmatores hanc consequentiam negare; sed hoc nihil est, nisi pura illusio, cum ita diserte ex doctrinâ suâ pendeat, nec minus ridiculum sit, quam si quis pertinaciter negaret, unum et duo facere tria." Compare Clarkson, vol. ii. c. viii. Relig. p. 216. "This doctrine is contrary to the doctrines promulgated by the Evangelists and Apostles, and particularly contrary to those of St. Paul himself, from whom it is principally taken."

† Loc. cit. p. 19. "Oportet igitur fateri, hoc esse Sanctorum fidei objectum principale et originale, quod sine hoc nulla certa et firma fides esse potest. Et sæpe hoc uno fides et producit et nutritur absque externis illis et visibilibus supplementis, ut in permultis sacramentorum literarum exemplis apparet: ubi solum dicitur, et loquutus est Dominus et verbum Domini tali factum est." P. 29: "Sed sunt qui fatentur Spiritum hodie afflare et ducere sanctos, sed hoc esse subjective non autem objective affirmant, i. e. ex parte subjecti illuminando intellectum ad credendam veritatem in Scripturâ declaratam, sed non præstando eam veritatem objective, sibi tanquam objectum Hæc opinio, licet priori magis tolerabilis, non tamen veritatem attingit: primo quia multæ veritates sunt, quæ ut singulos respiciunt, in Scripturâ non omnino inveniuntur, ut sequenti thesi ostendetur."

man, and manifesteth Himself to him, is, through the external revelation and the communication of Holy Writ, not rendered unnecessary, either for mankind in general, or even for such, as are acquainted with God's outward word. That that mysterious language of God is requisite for opening the sense of Scripture, and for admitting its contents into our soul, ought never to be doubted, says Barclay (this is the *revelatio subjectiva*); "for the things that are of God, no man knoweth, but the Spirit of God; and, therefore, have we received the Spirit that is of God, that we may know the things that are given us from God."—(1 Cor. ii. v. 11-12.)* But even in the Christian Church, the objective revelation is indispensable, and is to be considered as the primary source of truth, and Scripture as a revelation of a subordinate kind; for the source, from which Scripture itself flowed, must surely stand higher than the latter. It is by the testimony of the Spirit, Holy Writ itself first acquires authority; and, therefore, is the Spirit the first source of all knowledge and truth. In one

* Loc. cit. p. 48. "Licet igitur fateamur, scripturas scripta esse et divina et cœlestia, quorum usus ecclesiæ et solatio plenus et perutilis est, nec non laudemus Deum, quod mirâ Providentia scripta illa servaverit ita pura et incorrupta.....nihilominus tamen illas principalem originem omnis veritatis et scientiæ, et primariam adæquatam fidei et morum regulam nominare non possumus, quoniam oportet principalem veritatis originem esse ipsam veritatem, *i.e.* cujus certitudo et autoritas ex alio non pendet. Cum de amnis alicujus vel fluminis aquâ dubitamus, ad fontem recurrimus, quo reperto, ibi sistimus, nam ultra progredi non possumus, quia nimirum ille ex visceribus terræ oritur et scaturit, quæ inscrutabilia sunt. Ita scripta et dicta omnium ad æternum verbum adducenda sunt, cui si concordent, ibi sistimus; nam verbum illud semper a Deo procedit, et processit, per quod inscrutabilis Dei sapientia, et consilium non investigandum, in Dei corde conceptum, nobis revelatum est."

word, continue the Quakers, if it be true, that it is through the Spirit alone we are to arrive at the real knowledge of God; that through Him we are to be led into all truth, and are to be taught all things; then it is the Spirit, and not Scripture, which is the foundation, and the source of all knowledge and all truth, and the primary rule of faith.*

Moreover, it must be observed, that on very many relations of the spiritual life, and on numerous particulars, which are of great importance, Holy Writ imparts no instruction, and is, in part, incapable of so doing; that very many men are unable to read it even in their native tongue: that at all events, there is not one in a thousand conversant with the original languages, and that there are not three texts on which the interpretations of the learned agree. Under such circumstances, should man be abandoned to himself, or to other men? What doubts doth not even the history of the Biblical text give rise to? And how can a man convince himself from Scripture, that any disputed book—for instance, the epistle of James—is canonical? Because, perhaps, it is not in contradiction with other canonical books? Then every essay, which is not opposed to Scripture, may be admitted into the Canon! No alternative remains, but either to return to Rome, and receive, at the hands of her infallible Church, the Scriptural Canon, or to revere the Holy Spirit, as the first and principal fountain of truths.†

* Loc. cit. p. 49. "Illud, quod non est mihi regula in ipsas scripturas credendo, non est mihi primaria, adæquata fidei et morum regula: sed scriptura nec est, nec esse potest mihi regula illius fidei, qua ipsi credo ergo etc."

† Loc. cit. p. 67. "Exempli gratiâ, quomodo potest Protestans alicui neganti Jacobi epistolam esse canonicam per scripturam probare?.....

The Quakers, however, failed not to observe, that the revelations of the inward light, communicated to each individual, are not in contradiction with the outward word of Scripture, and even impart no other truths of salvation; but that they are only an eternally new, immediate manifestation of the same old gospel.* By this, however, they would by no means set up the Bible, as a check and a touchstone to the teaching of the inward light; for this would be again to make Scripture the arbiter of the Spirit, whose work it only is.

§ LXVII.—Continuation of the same subject.—Of Justification and Sanctification.—Perfect fulfilment of the Law.

The workings of this divine and inward light in man, as hitherto described, refer exclusively to the infusion of religious and ethical knowledge into the breast of man: but this light is also the source of all pious life. The day of visitation, graciously vouchsafed by the Almighty to every man, is to be the turning-point of his *whole* history, is, in every respect, inwardly to renew him,—in a word, is to establish his regeneration. On this matter of regeneration and of justification before God, the Quakers (if we except the different view they take of the relation between the Divine and the human operations in this work, whereof we shall have occasion

Ad hanc igitur angustiam necessario res deducta est, vel affirmare, quod novimus eam esse authenticam eodem spiritus testimonio, in cordibus nostris, quo scripta erat: vel Romam reverti dicendo, traditione novimus ecclesiam eam in canonem retulisse, et ecclesiam infallibilem esse; medium, si quis possit, inveniatur."

* Loc. cit. p. 33, 61, 63. "Distinguimus inter revelationem novi Evangelii, et novam revelationem boni antiqui Evangelii, hanc affirmamus, illam vero negamus."

to speak later,) very nearly coincide with the Catholic Church. And yet this coincidence they will not allow; and in virtue of deeply imbibed prejudices, taken in with their mothers' milk, they persuade themselves, that it is only in outward works, such as pilgrimages—fasting—the mechanical repetition of forms of prayer—mere outward alms-deeds—the use of the sacraments without any interior emotions—the gaining of indulgences, which the Quakers confound with forgiveness of sins—that Catholics think they render themselves acceptable to God. Under this misconception the Quakers assert, that by denying the value and meritoriousness of such-like pious exercises, Luther has, doubtless, rendered a great service; but in this, as in other points, they contend he is more to be praised for what he destroyed, than for what he built up.* For Luther and the Protestants, they say, have gone to the other extreme; as they have denied the necessity of moral works for justification, and made the latter consist, not in internal newness and sanctification, but solely in the belief in the forgiveness of sins.†

* Loc. cit. p. 159. “*Nobis minime dubium est, doctrinam hanc fuisse et adhuc esse in ecclesiâ Romanâ magnopere vitiatam; licet adversarii nostri, quibus, melioribus argumentis carentibus, sæpissime mendacia refugium et asylum sunt, non dubitarunt hoc respectu, nobis Papismi stigma inurere, sed quam falsò postea patebit.....Nam in hoc, sicut in multis aliis, magis laudandus est (Lutherus) in iis, quæ ex Babylone evertit, quam quæ ipse ædificavit.*”

† Loc. cit. p. 164. Barclay distinguishes between a two-fold redemption,—an objective and a subjective one. By the former, he understands the “*redemptio a Christo peracta in corpore suo crucifixo extra nos, et quâ homo, prout in lapsû stat, in salutis capacitate ponitur et in se transmissam habet mensuram aliquam efficaciam, virtute spiritûs vitæ, et gratiæ istius, quæ in Christo Jesu erat, quæ quasi donum Dei potens est superare et eradicare malum illud semen, quo naturaliter, ut*

The Quakers describe Justification as the stamping of Christ on our souls—as the Christ born and engendered within us, from whom good works spring, as fruits from the bearing tree;—as the inward birth within us, which bringeth forth righteousness and sanctification, purifieth and delivereth us from the power of evil, conquers and swallows up corrupt nature, and restores us to unity and communion with God. The doctrine of the Friends of Light, who, on this point, were truly enlightened, is, as every one must perceive, only the Catholic doctrine couched in other language; yet, when they wish to express themselves with perfect clearness, they make use of precisely the same formulas, as the Council of Trent.* Even the word “merit” is not unknown to them—the necessity of good works for salvation is openly asserted; the possibility of the ful-

in lapsû stamus, fermentamur.—Secundâ hâc cognoscimus potentiam hanc in actum reductam, quâ non resistentes, sed recipientes mortis ejus fructum, videlicet lumen, spiritum, et gratiam Christi in nobis revelatam, obtinemus et possidemus veram, realem, et internam redemptionem à potestate et prævalentiâ iniquitatis, sicque evadimus vere et realiter redempti et justificati, unde ad sensibilem cum Deo unionem et amicitiam venimus.—Per hanc justificationem Jesu Christi minimè intelligimus simpliciter bona opera, etiam quatenus a Spiritû Sancto fiunt; ea enim, ut verè affirmant Protestantes, effectus potius justificationis, quam causa sunt. Sed intelligimus formationem Christi in nobis, Christum natum et productum in nobis, a quo bona opera naturaliter procedunt, sicut fructus ab arbore fructiferâ: internus iste partus in nobis, justitiam in nobis producens et sanctitatem, ille est qui nos justificat, quocum contraria et corrupta natura.....remota et separata est.”

* Loc. cit. p. 165. Barclay here speaks of a “causa procurans,” instead of a “causa meritoria:” then he uses the formula, “causa formalis” and “formaliter justificatus,” whereby he understands the same as Catholics do.

filment of the law is demonstrated; and even the possibility of a total exemption from sin maintained.*

* Loc. cit. 1. p. 167. "Denique, licet remissionem peccatorum collocemus in justitiâ et obedientiâ a Christo in carne suâ peractâ, quod ad causam ejus procurantem attinet, et licet nos ipsos formaliter justificados reputemus per Jesum Christum intus formatum, et in nobis productum, non possumus tamen, sicut quidam (?) Protestantes incauti fecere, bona opera a justificatione excludere; nam licet propriè *propter* ea non justificemur, tamen *in* illis justificamur, et necessaria sunt, quasi causa sine quâ non" (by which the Quakers understand something different from the Majorists) p. 168. "Cum bona opera necessario et naturaliter procedant à partû hoc, sicut calor ab igne, ideò absolute necessaria sunt ad justificationem, quasi causa sine quâ non, licet non illud propter quod, tamen id in quo justificamur, et sine quo non possumus justificari: et quamvis non sint meritoria, neque Deum nobis debitorem reddant, tamen necessariò acceptat et remuneratur ea, quia naturæ suæ contrarium est, quod à Spiritû suo provenit, denegare. Et quia opera talia *pura* et *perfecta* esse possunt, cum à puro et sancto partû proveniant, ideoque eorum sententia falsa est, et veritati contraria, qui aiunt, sanctissima sanctorum opera esse polluta, et peccati maculâ inquinata: nam bona illa opera, de quibus loquimur, non sunt ea opera legis, quæ apostolus à justificatione excludit." P. 167. "Licet non expediat dicere, quod meritoria sint, quia tamen Deus ea remuneratur, patres ecclesiæ non dubitarunt verbo "meritum" uti, quo etiam forte nostrum quidam usi sunt sensû moderato, sed nullatenus Pontificiorum figmentis.....faventes." A singular strife forsooth, with the Papists, when the Quakers so express themselves respecting good works! Compare with this again page 195. Moreover the formula "*in illis*" justificari, instead of "*propter illa*," is very felicitous, for the latter expression is used in respect to the merits of Christ. Yet is the latter also scriptural, and the distinction between *causa meritoria* and *causa formalis* obviates all confusion. The question whether it be possible for a perfect Christian to abstain entirely from all sin, is answered in a special section. The thesis defended, runs as follows:—P. 197: "In quibus sancta hæc et immaculata genitura plene producta est, corpus peccati et mortis crucifigitur, et amoritur, cordaque eorum veritati subjecta evadunt et unita: ita ut nullis Diaboli suggestionibus et tentationibus pareant, et liberentur ab actuali peccato et legem Dei

Clarkson says, "The Quakers make but small distinction, and not at all such a one, as many other Christians, between sanctification and justification." "Faith and works," observes Richard Claridge, "are both included in our complete justification. Whoso is justified, is also in the determined degree sanctified; and in so far as he is sanctified, so far is he justified, and no further. The justification, whereof I speak, rendereth us righteous, or pious and virtuous through the continued aid, working, and activity of the Holy Spirit. With the same yearning as we sigh after the continued assistance of the Divine Spirit, and are prepared to evince the efficacy of His operations within us, shall we inwardly discern, that our justification is in proportion to our sanctification. For, as the latter is progressively developed, according to the measure of our confiding obedience to the revelation, and the infusion of grace, light, and the Spirit of God; so shall we not fail to perceive and feel the progress of our justification."* In respect to the degree which sanctification in this life can attain to, Clarkson, in full concurrence with Barclay, gives the following as the sentiment of the Quakers.

transgrediendo, eoque respectu perfecti sunt: ista tamen perfectio semper incrementum admittit, remanetque semper aliquâ ex parte possibilitas peccandi, ubi animus non diligentissimè et vigilantissimè ad Deum attendit."

* Vol. ii. Rel. c. xiii. p. 319. From Henry Tuke, a Quaker, the following passage is also cited, p. 321: "By this view of justification, we conceive the apparently different sentiments of the apostles, Paul and James, are reconciled. Neither of them says, that faith alone, or works alone, are the cause of our being justified; but as one of them asserts the necessity of faith, and the other that of works, for effecting this great object, a clear and convincing proof is afforded, that both contribute to our justification; and that faith without works, and works without faith, are equally dead."

“The Spirit of God, who redeemeth from the pollutions of the world, and implanteth in man a new heart, is regarded, by the Quakers, as so powerful in its operations, as to be able to exalt him to perfection. But, they would not, on this account, compare this perfection with that of God, because the former is capable of progression. This only would they assert, that in the state of internal newness, we can observe the Divine commandments; as Holy Writ relateth of Noah and Moses,” (Gen. vi. 9), of Job (i. 8), and of Zachary and Elizabeth, (Luke i. 6), “that they were righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and justifications of the Lord without blame.”*

Hence, we ought not to be surprised, if the same objections are urged against the Quakers, as against the Catholics; that they set up their own righteousness in the room of the righteousness of Christ. They reply to these objections, in the same way also, as Catholics are wont to do.

§ LXVIII.—Continuation of the same subject.—Doctrine on the Sacraments.

In the most consistent application of their fundamental principles, the Quakers convert the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper, into purely interior, and merely spiritual actions and ordinances. The Christian, they contend, needs no other seal to his inheritance (*signatura*)—no other pledge of his sonship, but the Spirit. To introduce outward acts of this kind is, in their estimation, entirely to misapprehend the

* Vol. ii. c. vii. sect. ii. p. 193. “This spirit of God is so powerful, in its operations, as to be able to lead him to perfection.”

religion of the Spirit, which Christianity undoubtedly is ; to renew a Jewish ceremonial service, and to relapse into Judaism ; nay, to approximate to Heathenism ; for such mere outward things, as we call sacraments, have sprung out of the same spirit as the Heathen worship ; whereas, Judaism observed holy rites prescribed by God. Accordingly, the Quakers assert, that the sacraments are not even to be considered as pledges of Divine promise left by Christ to his Church—nay, not even as emblems and aids to the remembrance of spiritual and historical facts—but as absolute misconceptions of actions and expressions of Christ—misconceptions absolutely inexcusable, for, they were the offspring of a Heathenish sense.

The baptism, which Christ ordained, is, in their opinion, merely the inward baptism of fire and the Spirit, whose existence renders utterly superfluous the watery baptism of John. Nay, they were even of opinion, that the water extinguishes the fire—that attention to the external rite draws off the eye from the interior, which is alone necessary. Baptism, accordingly, in their opinion, is nothing more than the ablution and purification of the spirit from the stains of sin, and the walking in newness of life.* The Scriptural proof for the proposition, that Christ has instituted no outward act of baptism, is managed with uncommon art, and is full of the most striking, singular, and forced constructions. Moreover, the writings of

* Loc. cit. p. 341. “Sicut unus est Deus, et una fides, ita et unum baptisma, non quo carnis sordes abjiciuntur, sed stipulatio bonæ conscientiae apud Deum per resurrectionem Jesu Christi, et hoc baptisma est quid sanctum et spirituale, scilicet baptisma Spiritûs et ignis, per quod consepulti sumus Christo, ut a peccatis abluti et purgati novam vitam ambulemus.”

Faustus Socinus, were much used by Barclay in this article of doctrine ; although, by this remark, I do not wish the reader to conceive it to be my opinion, that George Fox, the unlearned founder of the sect, had any knowledge of Socinian writings, and was anywise led by the same to the adoption of his views. Being a shepherd and shoemaker, such literary productions were totally inaccessible, or at least unknown to him ; but his really great, though perverted, mind was led only by the general connexion of ideas to his peculiar view of baptism. But Barclay, who undertook to demonstrate Fox's propositions, made, for this end, in the article in question, very evident use of the writings of Socinus.

The body and blood of the Lord is, according to the belief of the Quakers, perfectly identical with the divine and heavenly, the spiritually vivifying seed--with the inward light, whereof we had occasion to speak above.* They compare the words in John i. 4, "In him was the life, and the life was the light of men;" with the other text (vi. 50), "I am the living bread, which came down from heaven, and the bread, which I will give, is my flesh for the life of the world ; and they accordingly take "light," "life," "bread of life," and "flesh of Christ," and the inward Christ as synonymous terms. The Lord's supper, therefore, they describe as the inward participation of the interior man,

* Loc. cit. p. 380. "Corpus igitur hoc, et caro et sanguis Christi intelligendus est de divino et cœlesti semine ante dicto." P. 378. "Si quærat^{ur} quid sit illud corpus, quid sit ille sanguis ? Respondeo, cœleste illud semen, divina illa et spiritalis substantia, hoc est vehiculum illud, seu spirituale corpus, quo hominibus vitam et salutem communicat."

in the inward and spiritual body of Christ, whereby the soul liveth to God, and man is united with the Deity, and remaineth in communion with Him.*

§ LXIX.—Continuation of the same subject.—Rejection of a distinct order of ministry.—Preaching.—Public worship.

Carrying out their fundamental principle still further, and gradually drawing into its circle every thing else, the Quakers lay down, respecting public worship, the following maxims. No act of divine service is acceptable to God, which is produced and consummated by human activity and importunity: the Divine Spirit—the inward light, must be immediately efficacious, and alone determine, move, and conduct man. Hence, prayer and the praise of God, as well as exhortatory, instructive, and solacing discourses, must be the pure result of inspirations, which occur in the right cases, when, and where, and in so far as the utility of man requires.† Hence, very important consequences ensue.

* Loc. cit. p. 383. “Ita interna participatio est interioris hominis de hoc interno et spirituali corpore Christi, quo anima Deo vivit, et quo homo Deo unitur, et cum eo societatem et communionem habet.”

† Loc. cit. p. 287. “Omnis verus cultus, et Deo gratus, oblatus est spiritû suo movente interne, ac immediate ducente, qui nec locis, nec temporibus, nec personis præscriptis limitatur: nam licet semper nobis colendus sit, quod oporteat indesinenter timere coram illo, tamen, quoad significationem externam in precibus, elogiis, aut prædicationibus, non licet ea perficere nostra voluntate, ubi et quando nos volumus; sed ubi et quando eo ducimur motû et secretis inspirationibus Spiritus Dei in cordibus nostris; quæ Deus exaudit et acceptat, qui nunquam deest, nos ad precandum movere, quando expedit, cujus ille solus est iudex idoneus. Omnis ergo alius cultus, elogia, preces sive prædicationes, quas propriâ voluntate suâque intempestivitate homines peragunt, quas et ordiri et finire ad libitum possunt, perficere vel non perficere, ut

1. There is no distinct order of ministry, because the members of such an order, receive from men the qualification for their functions, whereas, this qualification can proceed *only* from the Spirit. By the institution of specific teachers, the human principle in the Church, received not only a preponderance over the Divine, but entirely superseded the same. The preaching of the Gospel is degraded into an art—nay, into a trade, which is learned and practised by long preparatory training; though it should be only an outpouring of high inspirations. To enable the preachers of the Church to say but something, they are supplied with a multitude of notices, gathered from the four quarters of the world, and often bearing a Heathenish stamp. And such things are to supply, or to communicate the Spirit of God! Hence, the discourses of such preachers are no words of life—no manifestations of higher power; and as they proceed not from a heart filled with God, they are incapable of rousing any one. It is a dry, dead, unfruitful ministry, which we have in the Church.*

ipsismet videtur, sive formæ præscriptæ sint, sicut Liturgia, etc. sive preces ex tempore per vim facultatemque naturalem conceptæ, omnes ad unum sunt cultus superstitiosus, Græce *ἑθελοθησκεία*, et idololatria abominabilis in conspectû Dei, quæ nunc in die spiritualis resurrectionis ejus deneganda et rejicienda sunt."

* Loc. cit. p. 275 "Et magna quidem causa est, quod tam aridum, mortuum, siccum, et sterile ministerium, quo populi eâ sterilitate fermentantur, hodie tantoperè abundat, et in nationibus etiam Protestantibus diffunditur, ita ut prædicatio et cultus eorum, sicut et integra conversatio a Pontificiâ vix discerni possit aliquo vivaci zelo, aut spiritûs virtute eos comitante, sed merâ differentiâ quarundam notionum et ceremoniarum externarum." P. 229. "Vita, vis, ac virtus veræ religionis inter eos multum periit, eademque, ut plurimum, quæ in ecclesiâ Romanâ mors, sterilitas, siccitas, et acarpia in ministerio eorum reperitur."

Even vicious men, deeply plunged in sins, can become and remain preachers, provided only they have a human calling! From such men the Spirit cannot come out, because they are void of its influence. Lastly, through the establishment of a separate ministry, the preaching of the doctrine of salvation, was debased into an instrument to the meanest ends; since, rich revenues and certain advantages of outward rank and social position, were connected with it. The Lord will have another kind of preaching; and whosoever, young or old, man or woman, high or low, learned or unlearned, shall be moved by the Spirit, may, and ought to preach, pray, and praise God publicly in the congregation.*

2. Another equally natural consequence from the aforesaid premises, is, that all set forms of liturgy are proscribed; as every prayer must spring immediately out of a heart, moved and incited by God. The meetings for divine service are, according to Barclay, solemnized in the following manner. In a plain, unadorned room, filled only with benches, in which no outward object can excite any religious feelings, the Friends of Light sit in the profoundest silence, in order to withdraw the mind from all earthly distractions, to free it from all connexion with the relations of every-

* The English Protestants required of the Quakers, that, as they despised the existing ministry of teachers, they should prove their mission by miracles, as, at an earlier period, the German Protestants had demanded of the Anabaptists. Their answer was the same, as that which Luther had given to the Catholics. Barclay, p. 245, "Yet, in order to preserve the purity of doctrine, the Quakers saw themselves compelled, by degrees, to admit a kind of itinerant teachers, and even to exercise a superintendence over them, by means of *human* ordinances." See Clarkson, vol. ii. Rel. c. x.-xi. p. 217, 276.

day life, and by this inward recollectedness, to fit it for hearing the voice of heaven. The spirit, however, in this abstraction from all outward things, ought not to strive after independence; nay, it must renounce itself, and act quite passively, in order to receive, in their untroubled purity, the Divine inspirations. This solemn stillness may last a half or whole hour, without experiencing any other interruption, save the sighs or groans of some souls agitated by the Spirit, until, at last, some member shall feel himself moved, by heaven, to communicate in a discourse or a prayer, according as the Spirit directs, the inward revelations he has received. It may even happen, that the meeting separates, without any individual having been moved to hold a discourse. Yet, nevertheless, the Quakers assure us, that their souls have, in the meantime, been saturated, and their hearts filled, with mysterious feelings of the Divine power and the Divine Spirit.* It also

* Barclaius, p. 297. “Imo sæpe accidit integras quasdam conventiones sine verbo transactas fuisse, attamen animæ nostræ magnopere satiatæ, et corda mire secreto divinæ virtutis et Spiritûs sensu repleta fuerunt, quæ virtus de vase in vas transmissa fuerit.” Clarkson gives the following account (vol. ii. Rel. c. xii. p. 279):—“For this reason (that men are to worship God only, when they feel a right disposition to do it), when they enter into their meetings, they use no liturgy or form of prayer. Such a form would be made up of the words of man’s wisdom. Neither do they deliver any sermons that have been previously conceived or written down. Neither do they begin their service immediately after they are seated. But, when they sit down, they wait in silence, as the apostles were commanded to do. They endeavour to be calm and composed. They take no thought as to what they shall say. They endeavour to avoid, on the other hand, all activity of the imagination, and every thing that rises from the will of man. The creature is thus brought to be passive, and the spiritual faculty to be disencumbered, so that it can receive and attend to the spiritual language of the Creator. If, during this vacation from all mental

sometimes happens, that, when the images of this lower world will not depart from a soul, that is looking forward to the manifestation of life (*vitæ apparitionem expectare*), a violent, convulsive struggle ensues, wherein the powers of darkness wrestle with those of light, like Esau and Jacob in the womb of Rebecca. The inward conflict (*prælium*) is outwardly evinced in the heaviest, most deep-felt groans, in tremblings, in the most convulsive movements of the whole body; until at last victory inclines to the side of light, and, in the excess of luminous outpourings, manifests itself with holy jubilee. In virtue of the union of all the members of a community in one body, the agitations of an individual, particularly if he be one of the more excited, are frequently imparted to the whole congregation; so that (to use the words of Barclay) “a most striking, and fearfully sublime scene is displayed, which of itself has irresistibly drawn many over to our society, before they had obtained any clear insight into our peculiar doctrines,” From such trembling and quaking, the Quakers have derived their name.* In this way, they think to get rid of all superstition in ceremonies, and of all man’s wisdom, which might so easily intrude into divine service, to abandon all things to inspiration from

activity, no impression should be given to them, they say nothing. If impression should be afforded to them, but no impulse to oral delivery, they remain equally silent. But if, on the other hand, impressions are given to them, with an impulse to utterance, they deliver to the congregation, as faithfully as they can, the copies of the several images, which they conceive to be painted upon their minds.”

* Loc. cit. p. 300. Others give other explanations: Clarkson, for instance, (vol. i. Introduct. vii.) says with other writers, “George Fox, on one occasion, called upon a judge *to quake* before the word of God; whereupon the judge called him a Quaker.”

heaven, and to establish a pure worship of God in Spirit and in truth.*

§ LXX.—Peculiar manners and customs of the Quakers.

We must now draw the attention of the reader to certain peculiarities of the Quakers, which have reference merely to civil life, and to certain habits and customs in their social intercourse. They refuse taking oaths to the civil magistrate, (to whom, however, except in matters of religion, they confess they owe obedience); and for conscience' sake, they abstain from all military service. The austere spirit of Quakerism totally interdicts games of hazard, since a being, endowed with the faculty of thinking, should be ashamed of them, and still more, because they are beneath the dignity of a Christian. With equal reason they add, that such-like games awaken passions, that obstruct the reception of religious impressions, and establish a habit immoral in itself. Not content with this, they declare themselves averse from games of every kind;—a declaration which we should be disposed to praise, did they not condemn, without restriction, all holding a different opinion in this matter. On the other hand, they are much to be censured for banishing, from their society, all music, vocal as well as instrumental. This, indeed, will not surprise us, when we consider that they employ neither kind of music for awakening and cherishing religious emotions (§ 68); and that any regard to the refining of

* Loc. cit. p. 297. "Hujus cultûs forma ita nuda est et omni mundanâ et externâ gloriâ expers, ut omnem occasionem abscindat, quo hominis sapientia exerceatur, neque ibi superstîtio et idololatria locum habet."—Compare pp. 293, 304.

the feelings, and to the culture of the sensibilities in general, still less any appreciation of music as an art, was not of course to be expected from the Quakers. Attendance at all theatrical shows, which on account of their connexion with idolatry, and of their gross nature not seldom shocking every tender feeling, were formerly interdicted in the ancient Church during her conflict with Heathenism;* and which from their, at all events, equivocal moral tendency, have, in subsequent ages, been ever regarded with a suspicious eye by men of piety; attendance at all theatrical shows, we say, is in the community of Quakers likewise not tolerated. In this particular they were certainly led by a good spirit. With the progress of intellectual cultivation (to view the subject only from a lower point of view), theatrical entertainments will certainly disappear, or at least will be aban-

* Lact. Instit. div. i. lib. vi. c. xx. “Si homicidium nullo modo facere licet, nec interesse omnino conceditur, ne conscientiam perfundat ullus cruor, comicæ fabulæ de stupris virginum loquuntur, aut amoribus meretricum: et quo magis sunt eloquentes, qui flagitia illa finxerunt, èo magis sententiarum elegantia persuadent, et facilius in hærent audientium memoriæ versus numerosi et ornati. Item tragicæ historiæ subjiçunt oculis parricidia, et incesta regum malorum et cothurnata scelera demonstrant. Histrionum quoque impudicissimi motus, quid aliud nisi libidines docent et instigant? Quorum enervata corpora, et in muliebrem incesum habitumque mollita, impudicas fœminas inhonestis gestibus mentiuntur. Quid de mimis loquar corruptelarum præferentibus disciplinam? Qui docent adulteria, dum fingunt, et simulatis erudiunt ad vera. Quid juvenes aut virgines faciant: cum et fieri sine pudore, et spectari libenter ab omnibus cernunt? Admonentur utique, quid facere possint, et inflammantur libidine, quæ aspectu maxime concitatur: ac se quisque pro sexû in illis imaginibus præfigurat, probantque illa, dum rident,” etc. When Lewis XIV, an admirer of the theatre, once asked Bossuet, whether attendance at the same were permitted, the prelate replied, “there are incontrovertible reasons against, but great examples for it.”

doned to those, who are not more enlightened than the men, who flatter themselves with being, in our time, the representatives of civilization. Were dignity and amenity of manners coupled with sincerity—were various knowledge and intellectual conversation more prevalent in the social circles, than they really are, many of those, who may now be termed passionate friends and patrons of the theatre, would prefer to derive the enjoyment they so highly value, rather from real life, than from the so troublous sphere of fiction, and would leave such entertainments to the uneducated or less educated, who think thereby to raise themselves above the crowd. In fact, nothing is more fit to exhibit, in all its nakedness, the utter insignificancy and void of conversation in cities, than frequent attendance at the theatre. The Quakers will one day be praised as the leaders of those, who, like them, but not precisely from the same motives, renounce the theatre, as they would a child's doll, and with indifference abandon its entertainments to the populace.* Even dances of every kind and without restriction, are, with most undue severity, considered an abomination by the Quakers, and not merely novels and romances of a certain description, but this whole class of poetry is banished from their society. It is easy to perceive that many things, which Catholic and Lutheran, as well as Calvinistic moralists disapprove, or even positively forbid, and which an incalculable number of individuals in all these religious communities will not sanction, is made a fundamental maxim in the Quaker sect, and with the more facility; for on one hand it comprehends only a few thousand men, and on the

* Clarkson (in *Mor. Educ.* vol. i. c. i. ix. p. 1-158,) sets forth and defends the various customs we have been describing.

other, it is confined almost exclusively to the lower classes of society, to whom many things, condemned by Quakerism, remain naturally inaccessible.

Of a different nature are the following traits, which contain obscure indications of a levelling system of social equality, and evince the strong tinge of democracy, peculiar to this sect. The usual salutations, "your Majesty," "your Lordship," "your Reverence," the Quakers ascribe to an unchristian arrogance, to a vain, worldly spirit. They believe the greeting, "your obedient servant," and the like, sprang out of hypocrisy, and they firmly act up to this belief in life: as, in the same way, they hold it to be a sin to take off the hat to any one, to address him in the plural number, and the like. They demand, for all these things, proofs from Holy Writ, without which they will not sanction them, especially as the Spirit has never inspired them to doff the hat, to salute the King as Majesty, and the like.*

§ LXXI.—Remarks on the doctrinal peculiarities of the Quakers.

With the utmost impartiality have we stated the doctrinal system of the Quakers, without being in anywise prepossessed against them; nay, we encountered them with a sort of predilection; for their earnest striving after an interior religion of the spirit and the heart—their fearless opposition to the spirit of the world, even where that opposition is petty and pedantic—their longing after the true celestial nourishment, and the inward unction by the Divine Spirit—their consciousness that, in Christ, a power is imparted, powerful enough

* Clarkson, vol. i. Peculiar Customs, ch. i. vii. p. 257-386.

not only to solace and to tranquillize man, but truly to deliver him from sin, and to sanctify him—all this has filled us with sentiments of the sincerest respect. We think, therefore, we are in a condition to investigate, with unprejudiced eye, the errors, whereon the system of Quakerism is founded.

The view of the Quakers respecting the relation of the Heathens to God, is, doubtless, far more tender than that of the Lutherans and the Calvinists—it originated in a purer and less narrow-minded perception of the moral phenomena in the pagan world. But, their peculiar explanation of the better elements in Heathenism, proceeded from a desire to set aside the opposition, which many facts in the history of fallen humanity, as well as the dictates of Christian feeling, raise against their views, as to the consequences of the fall; without, however, that explanation being at all well-founded in itself, or rising above the level of a mere arbitrary hypothesis. The description, which the Quakers give of fallen man, is, *in itself*, quite the same, as that set forth by the Lutheran formularies; and, therefore, *the history of man* will impose upon them, the solution of the same difficulties. But the mode, wherein they solved this problem, effaced the characteristic distinction between the Christian and the unchristian periods; and, on this account, it was, in the very beginning, objected to the Quakers, that by “the Divine seed,” “the inward light,” they understood merely the light of natural Reason, and did not at all believe, that the divine image in man, had been injured through the fall, and was again renovated in Christ Jesus only. And, in fact, maturer reflection subsequently led many Quakers to such an opinion. The injustice of the reproach made to them, consisted only herein, that they were charged with

an intentional deception of their contemporaries—with a crafty concealment of their real opinion ; whereas, it should have been only pointed out to them, that their views led necessarily to the assumption, that subsequently, as well as prior to his fall, man enjoyed precisely the same spiritual gifts ; so that redemption in Christ was thereby rendered totally unnecessary.

In truth, it would be very difficult, nay, impossible, for the Quakers to give a satisfactory answer to the question, whence it cometh to pass, that since the advent of Christ, the victory of light, over all the powers of darkness, hath, in all respects, been so decisively prominent ; if, before his incarnation, Christ had already worked in the souls *of all men in the same* mysterious way, as since his ascension into heaven ? The reason, wherefore the worship of nature hath ceased among Christians, polytheism disappeared, and the whole spiritual life of man become so far other than it is, among strangers to their creed, must, according to the view of Quakerism, remain a perpetual enigma. In any change, that in the lapse of ages may have occurred in the constitution of human nature, the Quakers cannot look for the cause of this phenomenon ; because we can in nowise discover, wherefore human nature, before the incarnation of the Logos, was worse and more unsusceptible of reform, than afterwards. But the mysterious, inward divine principle, which in Christ renovated humanity, cannot have brought about the great eventful era in history, because, according to the genuine doctrine of Quakerism, this principle ever evinced its operation before Christ also, and in the same mode, as at present.* To the knowledge of the incarnation of the

* Barclay on this matter has a very remarkable passage (p. 145),

Son of God, and of the works he wrought, during his earthly ministry, the Quakers could not be disposed to ascribe the great transformation of the world; for it is precisely to the history of Jesus Christ, and to an acquaintance with the same, that they attach no very great importance. And by the adoption of what they call the objective revelation, they hold preaching and Scripture, considered in themselves, to be everywhere superfluous;* since the inward light breaks out of itself, and is described not only as the first, but in case of neces-

where he appeals to a Scriptural text. From this we may see how the Quakers applied Scripture to their own views:—"Ad ea argumenta, quibus haecenus probatum est, omnes mensuram salutiferæ gratiæ habere, unum addam, idque observatû dignissimum, quod eximium illud Apostoli Pauli ad Titum dictum est, ii. 11, 'Illuxit gratia illa salutifera omnibus hominibus, erudiens nos, ut abnegatâ impietate et mundanis cupiditatibus, temperanter et juste et pie vivamus in præsentî sæculo;' quo luculentius nihil esse potest, nam utramque controversiæ partem comprehendit. Primo, declarat hanc non esse naturalem gratiam, seu vim, cum plane dicat esse salutiferam. Secundo non ait, paucis illuxisse, sed omnibus. Fructus etiam ejus, quam efficax sit, declarat, cum totum hominis officium comprehendat; erudit nos primo abnegare impietatem et mundanas cupiditates; et deinde totum nos docet officium, primo, temperanter vivere, quod comprehendit æquitatem, justitiam, et honestatem, et ea, quæ ad proximum spectant. Et denique, pie, quod comprehendit sanctitatem, pietatem, et devotionem, eaque omnia, quæ ad Dei cultum, et officium hominis erga Deum spectant. Nihil ergo ab homine requiritur, vel ei necessarium est, quod hæc gratia non doceat."

* Barcl. lib. l. p. 110. "Credimus enim, quod sicut omnes participes sunt mali fructus Adæ lapsus, cum malo illo semine, quod per eum illis communicatum est, proni et ad malum proclives sint, licet millies mille Adæ sint ignari, et quomodo prohibitum fructum ederit, ita multi possint sentire divini hujus et sancti seminis virtutem, eaque a malo ad bonum converti, licet de Christi in terram adventû; per cujus obedientiæ et passionis beneficium hâc fruantur, prorsus ignari sint."

sity, as even the only source of truths, which (in their essence) are the very same, that Jesus outwardly proclaimed, and committed to his Church.* The later Quakers appear likewise to feel the obvious difficulty here adverted to ; whether it be, that they themselves first observed it, or whether their attention were drawn to it by others. Be this as it may, Clarkson remarks in a note, "The Quakers believe that this Spirit was more plentifully diffused, and that greater gifts were given to men, after Jesus was glorified, than before." To this concession, they were driven by the force of evidence ; but in their system we cannot find a place, where it can possess an organic connexion with the whole. It is no ulterior developement of what already exists, but an unsuitable interpolation.†

If, from what has been said, it follows, that the contradictions, wherein the orthodox Protestantism is

* Lib. 1. p. 20. "Quod nunc sub litem venit illud est, quod postremo loco affirmavimus, scil. idem permanere et esse Sanctorum fidei objectum in hanc usque diem." It is not uninteresting to notice the Scriptural proofs, which Barclay adduces in support of his views. For instance, he says : "Si fides una est, unum etiam est fidei objectum. Sed fides una est ; ergo. Quod fides una sit, ipsa Apostoli verba probant ad Eph. iv. 5." Then he goes on : "Si quis administrationis objiciat diversitatem : Respondeo, hoc nullo modo objectum spectat, nam idem Apostolus, ubi ter hanc varietatem nominat, 1 Co. xii. 4, 5, 6, ad idem objectum semper recurrit. Sic 'idem Spiritus, idem Dominus, idem Deus.' Præterea nisi idem et nobis et illis erit fidei objectum, tunc Deus aliquò alio modo cognosceretur, quam spiritû ; sed hoc absurdum ; Ergo." And so he goes on at considerable length. And the inward Christ again naturally teaches, that these texts must be so interpreted ; although, according to all rules of interpretation, they bear quite a different sense.

† Clarkson, vol. ii. Bel. ch. vii. sect 2, p. 187. The Quakers believe, however, that this spirit was more plentifully diffused, and that greater gifts were given to men, after Jesus was glorified, than before.

involved with incontrovertible facts in human history, the Quakers only exchange for other contradictions against that history; we must now demonstrate that their theory is, in itself, perfectly unsatisfactory, and does not even escape those difficulties, which they principally aim at avoiding. They wish, as we have already perceived, to escape, in the first place, from the Calvinistic doctrine of absolute predestination, by asserting that to every man the inward light is proffered, and a day of visitation vouchsafed. They would fain, at the same time, escape from Pelagianism and semi-Pelagianism, which they ascribe to the Catholic Church, by deducing all the in anywise laudable acts that the heathen world once achieved, and still achieves, not in any degree from the spiritual nature of man, but solely from the inward word—the inward light.* Thereby they would fain show, that fallen man has every cause for humility; as he possesses nothing, not the least quality, which, in respect to divine things, can be active or efficacious; as every thing must be accounted for, solely and exclusively, by the inward Christ in each man. Alas! the Quakers, in wishing to attain one thing, render the other impossible; so that their combination is utterly untenable. Fallen man, according to them, has been so utterly bereaved of all higher faculties and powers, that the good which takes place in him, is wrought so *very independently* of him, that not even *in* his will, still less *by means of* his will, doth grace

* Loc. cit. p. 103. “Contradicit et enervat falsam Pelagianorum, Semipelagianorum et Socinianorum doctrinam, qui naturæ lumen exaltant et liberum hominis arbitrium; dum omnino naturalem hominem a vel minimâ in salute suâ parte excludit, ullo opere, actû vel motû suo, quoad primo vivificetur et actuetur spiritû Dei.”

consummate it.* The inward light of the Quakers is that sense for divine things, which in Adam all mankind had lost; yet by this, they understand not merely the restoration of a pre-existing, though torpid and paralysed faculty, to its original activity, but the entirely new creation of the faculty itself. In one word, it is the faculty of knowledge and of will in reference to divine things. Hence Barclay calls the inward light a new substance imparted to man, in opposition to an accidental one; and employs the expression, man receives thereby *the aptitude* for righteousness.† It must be

* Loc. cit. p. 189. “Posteriora opera (sc. gratiæ seu evangelii) sunt spiritûs gratiæ in corde, quæ secundum internam et spiritualem legem facta sunt; quæ nec in hominis voluntate, nec viribus ejus fiunt, sed per vim spiritûs Christi in nobis.” What then doth Barclay mean, when he says at times, that Divine grace is designed to resuscitate and excite anew the human faculties?

† Lib. I. p. 72. “Quis enim cum aliquâ rationis specie autumare potest, tale cor ex se habere potestatem, aut aptitudinem, vel aptum esse hominem ad justitiam perducendi?” It is worthy of remark, that the Protestants in their controversy with the Quakers, appealed to the text in Romans (c. xi. 14,) in the very same sense, as Catholics had once done in arguing with the Protestants. But Barclay says at p. 530:—“Respondeo, ‘hæc natura,’ intelligi nec debet nec potest de naturâ propriâ hominis, sed de naturâ spirituali, quæ procedit a semine Dei in homine Ita, ut bene concludamus, naturam, cujus hoc loco meminit Apostolus, quâ gentes dicuntur facere ea, quæ legis sunt, non esse communem hominum naturam, sed spiritualem naturam, quæ ex opere spiritualis et justæ legis in corde scriptæ procedit: fateor eos, qui alteram extremum tenent, quando hoc testimonio a Socinianis et Pelagianis (sicut etiam a nostris, quando hoc testimonio ostendimus, quomodo ex gentibus aliqui lumine Christi in corde salutem adepti sunt) premuntur, et ad angustias reducuntur, respondere, quasdam reliquias cœlestis imaginis in Adamo relictas esse Sed cum hoc absque probatione affirmatum sit, ita et dictis suis alibi contradicit, quo etiam causam suam amittunt.” P. 108: “Non intelligimus hanc gratiam, hoc lumen et semen esse accidens, ut plerique inepte

obvious to every one, that the Quakers have only here renewed the old Lutheran opinion respecting the divine image,—its utter obliteration through the fall, and its restoration in Christ. There is here, as is evident, but this difference,—that the Quakers fix this restoration of the divine image immediately after the fall, and ascribe to it a far greater power against sin. Hereby they became involved in the same inextricable difficulties, with which the Lutheran theory had to contend. They set the natural man too low, to enable them to escape from the doctrine of absolute predestination. They say, indeed, like the Lutherans, man is able to resist, or not to resist, divine grace. But if, by his resistance, he is to incur guilt, he must be allowed the faculty of independently *discerning*, by the aid of grace, that a truth presented to him conduces to his salvation: he must, accordingly, embrace this truth with *his own* will. But such faculties the Quakers deny to fallen man; and therefore they have no alternative, than, either to refer to God *alone* the overcoming of resistance, and thereby to subscribe to the tenet of absolute predestination, which they so strongly condemn in Calvin; or to impute it to accident alone, when grace triumphs or is resisted. But accident is only another word for fate.*

faciunt, sed credimus esse realem, spiritualement substantiam, quam anima hominis apprehendere et sentire potest."

* Clarkson on this, as on other points, differs considerably from Barclay. He endeavours not only to supply the gaps in the system of the Quakers, but to render that system more scriptural, and thereby more rational, than it is in itself; but in this attempt he introduces not only contradictions into it, but very harsh discords into his own productions. He may, nevertheless, record the views of more sensible, yet inconsistent Quakers. Clarkson fills up Barclay's statement in respect to the condition of the Paradisaic Adam; because to this subject, willingly or unwillingly, men must ever recur. In imitation of

Upon the so-called objective revelation, we have many doubts to suggest; they are chiefly as follows.—

Catholics, Clarkson distinguishes a two-fold image of God in man—a remoter, and a more proximate one, yet in a different sense from us. The former is the human mind, called “the mental understanding—the power of Reason.” (Revelation etc. vol. ii. c. i. p. 114.) This faculty he describes as that, “by means of which man was enabled to guide himself in *his temporal concerns*.” Thus there would not exist in man, as such, any faculty having reference to God and to the supermundane. The *proper* image of God in man Clarkson then describes, as a spiritual faculty *independent* of human Reason, (the words understanding, power of discernment, and the rest, are, in his opinion, synonymous terms.) This faculty is a portion of the very life of the Divine Spirit—an emanation from Divine Life, whereby man discerns his relation to God, and keeps up communion with his Creator. “But he gave to man at the same time, *independently* of his own intellect or understanding, a spiritual faculty, or a portion of the life of his own spirit, to reside in him. This gift occasioned man to become more immediately, as it is expressed, the image of the Almighty. It set him above the animal and rational part of his nature. It made him spiritually-minded. It enabled him to know his duty to God, and to hold a heavenly intercourse with his Maker Adam, then, the first man, independently of his rational faculties, received from the Almighty into his own breast, such an emanation from the life of His Spirit.....” According to *these* statements, it cannot, in the first place, be *absolutely* asserted, that, through the Fall, man has lost the Divine image; for, even after that catastrophe, he would still retain the mental powers having reference to earthly life—the remoter image of God, and even, according to Clarkson (as above stated), still a part of the likeness unto God, in the strict sense. Secondly, these statements would very well explain the cause, wherefore it is possible for the Quakers to deduce *entirely*, from divine inspirations, all true religious instruction—all genuine prayer, etc.; for, according to this system, no human faculty would have any relation whatsoever to supermundane things. Thirdly, this theory would agree very well with that of Barclay; it would, indeed, contain more than the latter had stated; but nothing which he might not have advanced, without introducing any change in his principles. But, among the above-mentioned propositions, expressions like the following, occur: “It (the

All outward special Révelations, and even the Incarnation of the Logos, are, by that objective Revelation, rendered, not only superfluous, but even inexplicable. For, if God's spirit is to reveal immediately, to every man, the fit measure of truths,—if thus the voice of God is, in this way, to go forth to all men, what end can He still propose in His special Revelations? If all men be prophets, then, a distinct prophetic ministry must needs be abolished. And in fact, in order to prove their so-called general objective Revelation, the Quakers appeal, with the greatest boldness, to the particular revelations, which were vouchsafed to the prophets of old.

But, it is principally to the self-consciousness of man, and the laws and conditions, under which it is formed and unfolded, the doctrines of Quakerism run counter. It can be demonstrated, that, without an intellectual excitation, and an extraneous influence, the self-consciousness of man cannot be developed—a law which, so far from being set aside, is directly confirmed, by the historical Revelations of God. Hence, if man is to attain to the true knowledge of the Deity, the inward,

image of God in the strict sense) made him know things not intelligible *solely* by his reason." The things of earth, therefore, would not be the only sphere, within which reason would have to move; but only it could not, by its unaided efforts, apprehend God. But, if the co-operation of reason were necessary to the knowledge of God; then it would be *every where* indispensable; and thereby the whole view of the Quakers, respecting preaching and the rest, would fall to the ground; and yet, Clarkson puts forward as Quakerish, the very same views as Barclay. Lastly, if the activity of *Reason* be unavoidable, when *the knowledge of God* is concerned, so is the *co-operation of the will* equally indispensable, when the *love of God* is the question. But this according to Barclay, the Quakers will by no means admit; while Clarkson asserts the contrary.—Ibid. p. 188.

Divine Light must ever be associated with the outward Light; the external must correspond to the internal Revelation; and the inward inspiration can be understood, only by means of the outward communication. Even in respect to the prophets, and envoys of God, whom the Christian recognises, it can be proved, that, their inward illuminations were not without all external media,—whether the Spirit revealing Himself to them assumed a sensible shape; or whether He annexed His revelations to long pre-existing doctrines, and expectations. It is only the Son of God, whom we must except from this rule; for here the absolute Spirit, exempt from the limitations of mere relative beings, appeared in the world, and conjoined Himself with a human nature in the unity of one consciousness. Yet, it cannot be proved from the Scripture-History, that the human mind of the Redeemer had been developed, without any external human influence.

The question now occurs, how have the Quakers come to their remarkable opinion, that the consciousness of God can be formed independently of outward teaching, nay, of all outward influence whatever; and whether this view may not be considered, as a necessary developement of the errors of the Reformation. If, in contempt of all the laws of the human mind, Luther taught that, in the regenerated soul of man, new faculties were implanted, through an absolute exercise of divine influences; surely, it was inconsistent to prescribe to these faculties, thus absolutely imparted from within, outward conditions for their insertion. If, in the interior of the human mind, these faculties needed no points of contact—if, in order to become the property of man, they presupposed no kindred qualities—if they worked in the soul, in a manner contrary to the

constitution of man—if, they were exceptions from the whole order of human nature; with what justice could it be said, that the conditions of *external* excitation and teaching, in other respects requisite to the development of the human mind, were here necessary? How could those acts of Divine power preserve the assumed character of absoluteness, if they were subjected to limitations? Was it no contradiction to let the Divine Principle work unconditionally on one hand, and conditionally on the other? Thus the Lutheran exemption of the Divine influence from all internal conditions, implanted in the human spirit, involved also, by a necessary connexion of ideas, an independence of this influence on all outward conditions; and now only, could harmony and completeness be introduced into the system. Hence, from this point of view, Quakerism must be denominated the consummation of Lutheranism; and to that expression of the Wittemberg Reformer, “God teacheth man only inwardly,” it first assigns a true meaning.

We must look at the matter thus. All instruction, which man receives through the instrumentality of man, or which he acquires for himself, by reading books, is founded on the supposition, that he is endowed with certain still dormant faculties, which, set in motion by those exercises, are resuscitated and become living; so that, what is preestablished—what already exists in man as a prototype, is, through external influence, brought home to his consciousness. But now, the Lutherans deny to fallen man the Divine image—the religious capability. What possible effect, preaching, or the reading of Holy Writ, could produce for the awakening of the soul, we are at a loss to understand; since man had nothing more than to be awakened. The system, wherein the necessity of

outward teaching could be proved, was a far different one from the Lutheran, which, instead of the *training* of the religious faculties, imagined *a new creation* of the same; wherein, therefore, instruction, through reading and writing, could as little find its place, as in the creation of the aforesaid qualities in the first man. By no instruction can the faculty, for any kind of knowledge, be infused into the mind of the pupil; as for instance, an aptitude for the mathematical sciences is not given by tuition. Luther's doctrine, accordingly, as to the necessity of outward teaching for regeneration in Christ, had no sort of connexion with his propositions respecting the Fall of man. The Quakers understood, or, at least, felt this inconsistency; and while they asserted, that through Adam, fallen man was deprived of all religious faculties, capable of being excited and trained by any external agency, they declared likewise against the necessity of any outward instruction; and, thereby, established the fairest symmetry in the doctrinal edifice, laid down by Luther, clearly revealing at the same time, however, the utter hollowness of its foundations.

But, hereby also, the ground was completely cut away from the outward, historical Revelation of God in Christ. The Quakers, indeed, uphold the doctrine, that for the sake of Christ's merits, that inward, supernatural light hath been vouchsafed to man. But the sacrifice, which Christ offered up for the sins of the world, considered in itself, is utterly untenable in the system of the Quakers; and as regards this matter alone, we might just as well say, the Son of God, without its being necessary to make this known to men, might, in some obscure corner of the earth, or in the planets Mars, Uranus, and the rest, have undergone any suffering,

and atoned for our guilt. That the love, which God evinced in the mission of His Son, should be brought to our *knowledge*—that we should be *instructed* in the sentiments of God—that we should be *taught* our own destiny, are things, which indeed, necessarily, appertain to the work of Redemption ; but which yet cannot be established, by the principles of the Quakers. Hence, they make a reply devoid of all solidity, when, in answer to the objection, that they deny the knowledge of Christ's History to be necessary to our true conversion to God, they declare they hold the same to be not requisite for those only, who are beyond the pale of Christianity, for, these are taught all truth by the inward Christ ; but that, as to those living within the bosom of the Christian Church, they inculcate the necessity of their making themselves acquainted with the history of Christ,* and of believing in the same. This answer, we say, is futile ; for, it is impossible to discover, wherefore what is absolutely necessary for the one, should be unnecessary to the other, for the attainment of the same object. Hence, a celebrated member of the sect, Keith, was, in several synods, declared devoid of the spirit of the Quakers, and was forbidden to preach ; because he could not convince himself, that Faith, in the death and the resurrection of Christ, was not necessary to salvation. And Spangenberg, the celebrated bishop of the Herrnhutters, in his biography of Count Zinzendorf, thus speaks from a personal knowledge of the Quakers ; “ the doctrine of Christ crucified, and that in His sacrifice alone men can find grace, and deliverance from all sins, is to them, as to all the sages of this world, a mere

* Loc. cit. p. 110. “ Sicut credimus, omnino necessarium esse iis historiam externam Christi credere, quibus Deus ejus scientiam voluit

foolishness, and is beyond their discernment.* We therefore are not surprised, when we are informed, that many American Quakers explain away the whole history of Christ into a mere allegory; and what Barclay so often said, respecting the Christ crucified through sin in every man, respecting the inward Word suffering through the pressure of sin, &c., served to pave the way for the opinion, which sees, in the historical Christ, only a philosophical, anthropological, religious Mythos.† An historical, visible Christ cannot consist with the invisible, purely spiritual Church of these one-sided spiritualists of Christianity; a Redeemer graciously condescending to the wants and infirmities of our nature, stands in too abrupt a contrast, with these high-flying idealists, to allow them to revere Him as their

aliquo modo communicare; ita ingenue fatemur, hanc externam scientiam esse consolabundam illis, qui subjecti sunt, et hoc interno semine et lumine acti: nam non solum sensû mortis et passionum Christi humiliantur, sed et in fide confirmantur, et ad sequendum præstantissimum ejus exemplum animantur nec non sæpissime reficiuntur et recreantur gratiosissimis sermonibus, qui ex ore ejus procedebant."

* But from this, it must not be inferred, as has sometimes been done, that the Quakers never believed in Christ's death of atonement. On this point Barclay's language permits no manner of doubt. He says (p. 109); "*Per hoc nullo modo intelligimus, neque volumus minuire, nec derogare a sacrificio et propitiatione Jesu Christi, sed e contra magnificamus et exaltamus illam,*" etc. Compare p. 148-164, and other numerous passages. In Clarkson, *ibid.* p. 320, we find also the following passage, cited from a Quaker, Henry Tuke; "So far as remission of sins, and capacity to receive salvation, are parts of Justification, we attribute it to the sacrifice of Christ, in whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of his grace."

† A friend of mine, who, a few years ago, met two American Quakers in the West Indies, has assured me, that, in conversing with them on religion, he found they allegorized the whole history of our Lord.—*Trans.*

Master, in all the fulness of conviction. Hence, as in ecclesiastical history, we often encounter similar deductions, from similar principles; they were compelled also to reject the outward, visibly self-manifesting Christ, and to transform Him into something purely spiritual—a mere naked idea, in order that the disciples might not be ashamed of their Master, and the foundation might be made to harmonize with the superstructure of their Christianity. Thus was Protestantism, when pushed to its farthest point, formally converted into a species of Gnosticism; so that Christ could be regarded by the Quakers, exactly in the same light, as by the Jewish Docetæ. The humanity of Christ is the necessary and essential form of His divinity, as the Author of revelation in the new Covenant. In the same way, *and even for that very reason*, the Church, with her fundamental institutions, is the essential form of the Christian Religion: and if we separate the form from the substance, then the latter will, in the end, inevitably dissolve into a mere phantastic void, and retroactively, Christ will sink into a mere creature of the brain.

In perfect conformity with its fundamental principles, the false spiritualism of the Quakers manifests the most decided hostility against all theological science; and they are at a loss to find words to express their sentiments of detestation towards it, as well as to testify their regret, that it should have passed from the times of *apostasy* (as they call the ages prior to the Reformation), over to the period of Protestantism. But, herein also, they continue only more violently, and push to the furthest extreme, that condemnation of all severe scientific culture, which, at the commencement of the revolution in the Church, was so often expressed by the Lutherans. Scientific labours are not possible without

human exertion ; but it is precisely all human activity, which the Quakers wish to banish from the sphere of theology.* They are, on that account, averse from all which wears the aspect of a settled, definite religious notion ; and, therefore, urged by an instinct, which, according to their views, is perfectly correct, they avoid all the technical expressions of the School and the Church, and only on certain subjects, on which they cannot otherwise make themselves generally intelligible, they permit a deviation from this rule. But, hereby it happens that they mostly revolve in vague religious feelings, foster a doctrinal indifferentism ; and, as many among them are utterly unconscious of any thing deserving the title of real Christianity, so, the whole system of Quakerism would, by degrees, dissolve into dull, hollow phantasies, were it not, from time to time, brought back to the positive *doctrines* of Christianity, by some extraneous influence, as this appears to have been recently the case.†

* Clarkson (and the language of Barclay is still stronger) says, loc. cit. p. 249 : “ They reject all school divinity, as necessarily connected with the ministry. They believe, that if a knowledge of Christianity had been obtainable by the acquisition of the Greek and Roman languages, and through the medium of the Greek and Roman philosophers, the Greeks and Romans themselves would have been the best proficient in it ; whereas, the Gospel was only foolishness to many of these.” Here we find truth and falsehood intermixed.

† Clarkson (loc. cit. p. 313), says in a tone of approval : “ The Quakers have adhered, as strictly as possible, to Scriptural expressions, and thereby they have escaped from many difficulties, and avoided the theological controversies, which have distracted the remainder of the Christian Church.” In the Heathen worships, also, we find no *doctrinal* controversies, precisely because they had no doctrine, and furnished no subject-matter for *thought*, but only for *fancy* and for *feeling*. Had the primitive Christians been so like the Quakers, as the latter flatter themselves, Christianity would have long since disap-

How little, in fine, their peculiar conceptions of Baptism, the Lord's supper, and divine worship in general, agree with the essence of an outward, historical Revelation, and with the nature and the wants of the human mind (even overlooking here their, in truth, highly afflicting distortion of Scriptural testimonies); it were almost needless to examine. But the truth to be found in their doctrine on those matters, to wit, that baptism is no mere bodily ablution, but a baptism by fire and the Spirit, and that the Lord's Supper should lead to an inward communion with God, is, by no means, peculiar to these sectaries. What mortal weariness, vacancy of mind, and dulness; what sickly fancies most of their

peared. For this depends upon a *doctrine* pronounced by the Supreme Intelligence: *notions* and *ideas* lie at the bottom of its facts; so that, through the former, it calls up genuine feelings and true life. I have, moreover, seldom known any one, who censured the phraseology of the Church, without discovering at the same time, that he was tolerably indifferent about dogmas. For it is only in a very few cases, that a reverence for the Bible, pushed to superstition, leads to the conduct we condemn, and which would hold the words of *Scripture alone* as holy, and every thing else as profane—a superstition, besides, with which the other views of the Quakers, as to Holy Writ, do not well coincide. They do not, for example, use the words “Trinity,” “Persons,” and the rest, when they speak of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and their mutual relations; but, on that very account, their doctrine, on this matter, is so loose and indefinite, that Arians, Sabellians, Photinians, and even disciples of Paul of Samosata, could make use of their formulas of expression. No occasion is, indeed, furnished for disputes; but only because no matter exists for investigation. They say, “they find the word “Trinity” neither in Justin Martyr, nor in Irenæus, nor in Tertullian, nor in Origen, nor in the Fathers of the first three centuries of the Church.” p. 314. Truly, if they will not read the books of these fathers, they will find nothing in them; for, otherwise, they would have met with the word in question, in Theophilus of Antioch, Tertullian, Novatian, Origen, Dionysius of Rome, and Dionysius of Alexandria.

members labour under, during the silence in their religious meetings, God knows, and every man may infer, who has acquired any knowledge on this subject, from his own personal observation, or the experience of others.* In order to draw, from itself, food for meditation, great extent of knowledge, and great ability—a soul perfectly imbued with faith are requisite. But even this the Quakers will not have—absolute revelations are what they look for, during that silence. The Divine Spirit annexes its inspirations only to what pre-exists in the soul; and it is a thorough illusion, though easily to be accounted for, when they think that the thoughts and the feelings, which arise during this self-collectedness of the spirit, are pure and immediate creations of the inward Light.† On the contrary, they

* A writer observes : “Hence it comes to pass, that, in a Quaker meeting, you find a museum of stupid faces ; and yet, among the members of that meeting, there are but very few blockheads. Many Quakers appear, like Jacob, to expect heavenly apparitions in sleep ; for, in every Quaker meeting, I have found sleepers. Others sit with a countenance, on which weariness herself has evidently fixed her throne.”

† Clarkson (vol. ii. p. 146) has a passage which gives a beautiful and instructive psychological explanation of the manner, in which the Quakers arrived at their opinion, that, without any exertion of the human mind, higher thoughts and feelings are implanted within us. The fact, that not seldom, man is quite involuntarily raised up to God ; that without any conscious preparation on his part, he sinks into religious meditations, and inwardly rejoices in his God and Redeemer, furnished them occasion for their theory. As the passage we have in view evinces, at the same time, the tender feelings of the Quakers, we think it expedient to cite it. “The Society,” says Clarkson, “considers the Spirit not only as teaching by inward breathings, as it were, made immediately and directly upon the heart, without the intervention of outward circumstances, but, as making the material objects of the universe, and many of the occurrences of life, if it be properly attended to, subservient to the instruction of man, and as enlarging

are only resuscitations of good, by the medium of what has long preexisted, of what has been communicated from without, and inwardly received and retained by *the human* mind. However much they protest against human agency, they must have it ; and, under all forms, it will manifest itself. For, the little ones in mind as well as body, such a religious service will, in every instance, be totally unproductive of fruit ; and the illusion, that the Divine Spirit here evinces an absolute creative power, is, in this respect, most strikingly evident ; for, if the Quaker-view be correct, what hinders the Spirit from selecting, at times, a child six weeks old, for the office of preaching and prayer ? If, in the mind of man nothing preexist, to which the spirit can annex its inspirations—if, that spirit be to create all anew,

the sphere of his instruction in this manner, in proportion as it is received and encouraged. Thus, the man who is attentive to these divine notices, sees the animal, the vegetable, and the planetary world with spiritual eyes. He cannot stir abroad, but he is taught in his own feelings, without any motion of his will, some lesson for his spiritual advantage ; or he perceives, so vitally, some of the attributes of the Divine Being, that he is called upon to offer some spiritual incense to his Maker. If the lamb frolics and gambols in his presence, as he walks along, he may be made spiritually to see the beauty and happiness of innocence. If he finds the stately oak laid prostrate by the wind, he may be spiritually taught to discern the emptiness of human power ; while the same Spirit may teach him inwardly the advantage of humility, when he looks at the little hawthorn, which has survived the storm. When he sees the change and the fall of the autumnal leaf, he may be spiritually admonished of his own change and dissolution, and of the necessity of a holy life. Thus, the Spirit of God may teach men by outward objects and occurrences in the world. But, where this Spirit is away, or rather where it is not attended to, no such lesson can be taught. Natural objects, of themselves, can excite only natural ideas ; and the natural man, looking at them, can derive only natural pleasure, or draw natural conclusions from them. In looking at the sun, he may be pleased with its warmth,

a child can then surely be its organ, as well as an adult.

What the Quakers tell respecting the struggle between the Divine inward Light, and the powers of darkness, that during their religious assemblies, seek to entangle and to retain them in worldly distractions, it is not difficult to understand. The human mind can enter, far more easily and more deeply, into its own interior, and be brought into a more beneficial train of feelings, when it fixes its attention on a matter, presented to it from without, exercises its reflection on the same, and then makes an independent attempt at meditation.

and anticipate its advantage to the vegetable world. In plucking and examining a flower, he may be struck with its beauty, its mechanism, and its fragrant smell. In observing the butterfly, as it wings its way before him, he may smile at its short journeys from place to place, and admire the splendour upon its wings. But the beauty of Creation, is dead to him, as far as it depends upon connecting it spiritually with the character of God ; for, no spiritual impression can arise from any natural objects, so that these should be sanctified to him, but through the intervention of the Spirit of God."

Great and important, and universally admitted truths are here professed. It is only to him, who is already awakened and illuminated by Divine Grace, that nature truly testifies of God and of all things divine ; nay, every particular thought, that springs fresh and joyous up to God, and warms the heart, even if it be occasioned only by outward objects, is still excited by God's grace. But, without the human spirit and its concurrent activity, no ray, whether it light on us from without or from within, can possibly impregnate : and this truth the Quakers themselves involuntarily admit, since they must annex the condition ; "*who is attentive to these Divine notices, who sees the world with spiritual eyes.*"

Note of the Author.

We see, from the above-cited passage of Clarkson, how on this point also, the tender-thoughted Quakers approximate to our Church ; for this habit of making nature a medium for spiritual contemplations, is one recommended and practised by Catholic ascetic writers.—*Trans.*

But, according to the method adopted by the Quakers, it is only the minds of very few that can remain free from distractions ; whereupon they are naturally thrown into great anguish, terror and trembling ; so that what they take to be a sign of the proximity and visitation of the Divine Spirit subduing the powers of Satan, is an evident symptom of the perversity of the whole sect.

CHAPTER III.

THE HERRNHUTTERS, OR THE COMMUNITY OF BROTHERS,
AND THE METHODISTS.

§ LXXII.—Historical remarks.—The Moravian brethren.

THE doctrinal peculiarities of the party, to which we are now to devote our attention, were formed out of the union of the principles of the Moravian brethren, with those of Spener's pietistic school. It will, therefore, be incumbent on us, in the first place, to give a short account of the two last-named religious parties. In despite of all attempts to bring about a union between the Catholics and the Hussites, a considerable number of the latter continued separated from the Church, down to the period of the Reformation, which inspired them with new hopes, and infused fresh life and youthful vigour into their body.

The Hussites and Luther early recognized their spiritual affinity, and entered into a close outward union with each other; in consequence whereof, the former embraced the doctrinal views of the latter, as being the stronger party. The doctrine of the non-united Hussites needed, in fact, a considerable change, to enable them to join with the German reformer; for John Huss and Martin Luther, however they might agree, in their notions of the Church and the necessity of a Reformation, that would undermine its fundamental law, were yet, in some essential doctrines, diametrically opposed. We shall now take a brief survey of the mutual relations between Luther and the later Hussites, who under the

name of the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren protracted their existence.

The Bohemian Church-Reformer had no idea, of that doctrine of justification, put forth by the Saxon ; and, accordingly, his view of human works and conduct, was essentially different. Huss laid down the most rigid maxims, in matters of ecclesiastical discipline ; of whose impracticable severity we may form an idea, when we recall to mind, that among the four conditions, which his disciples proposed to the Catholics, as a basis for a reunion, there was one, that all mortal sins, under which they included “gluttony, drunkenness, incontinence, lying, perjury, usury, the receiving of any money for mass and confession, and the like,” should be punished with death ! A party among them even desired that the power of inflicting the penalty of death on any one, whom he should see polluted with one of the above-mentioned sins, should be conceded to every private individual. Huss, doubtless, had not proceeded to such lengths in his reforming zeal ; yet, the excitement he raised, was of a nature necessarily calculated to lead to such unheard-of excesses of fanaticism. That no prince, or prelate guilty of any grievous sin, is entitled to obedience, was even an opinion formally inculcated by Huss. With such passionate exclusiveness, did these sectaries turn to the practical side of Religion, that, not content with the demand just adverted to, they had also the assurance to require of Catholics, to hold as a heathen any man who should let himself be nominated master of the liberal arts, as well as to annihilate all scientific institutions. The soothing influence of time, maturer reflection on the constitution of human nature, and a calmer temper of mind—brought about by want and misery—produced,

however, by degrees, many in all respects beneficial changes among the disciples of Huss. On the other hand, those among them, who were known under the name of the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren, adopted, in their intercourse with the Waldenses, doctrinal errors, totally unknown to Huss, as well as to the Calixtines and their ecclesiastical head, Roxyccana. From the latter, who, by degrees, were to be distinguished from Catholics merely by a ritual difference—the use of the cup in communion—the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren, separated in the year 1450, denied (if we may at least so infer from an apology published in the year 1508, and from some earlier documents) not only the doctrine of transubstantiation, but also that of the corporal presence of Christ in the Eucharist; and professed, if any definite meaning is to be drawn from their expressions, nearly the same theory, as was afterwards put forth by Calvin on this subject. They retained, moreover, the seven sacraments, yet, as we may conceive, without admitting Catholic ordination; since Christ, according to them, is the immediate source of all ecclesiastical power. Lastly, they rejected purgatory and the veneration of saints. They were ever distinguished by a very rigid moral discipline, and by the vigorous use of excommunication. According to the custom of the old Waldenses, they numbered three classes—the beginners, the advancing, and the perfect; and according to the measure of his spiritual growth, placed the individual in one of these grades. These are now the doctrinal and the disciplinary peculiarities of those Hussites, denominated Bohemian and Moravian Brothers, and at the moment, indeed, when they formed a conjunction with Luther.

Contrary to his usual course, Luther treated with

great indulgence, the opinion of "the Brothers" on the Lord's Supper, and thereby served his own ends uncommonly well. For they agreed, in the year 1536, to subscribe to the belief in the presence of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist,* and adopted the fundamental points in the Lutheran doctrine of justification; though, on the necessity of sanctification and of good works, they held a far more distinct and forcible language than Luther.† This occurred in a public confession, delivered to King Ferdinand. From this time, the league between the Brothers of Wittemberg and of Bohemia was solemnly concluded, and Luther formed a very advantageous opinion of the latter. In the preface, which he prefixed to the edition of their symbolical writing, just adverted to, he says, "he had formerly been ashamed of the Picards," (for so his present friends were once called,) "but now, they were much more agreeable, courteous, he might say, sounder, correcter, and better in their conduct." It by no means redounded to their dishonour, that they sent an embassy to Luther, with the purpose of calling his attention to the scandalous morals of his disciples, and of strongly urging on him the necessity of a *reformation in this matter*. "The Bohemian Brothers," (these are the words of Francis Buddeus, the Lutheran theologian,)

* Confess. Bohemica Art. XIII. in Augusti (loc. cit. part ix. p. 205.) "Item et hic corde credendum ac ore confitendum docent, panem cœnæ dominicæ verum Christi corpus esse, quod pro nobis traditum est, calicemque verum sanguinem ejus, etc. Docent etiam, quod his Christi verbis, quibus ipse panem corpus suum, et vinum speciatim sanguinem suum esse pronunciat, nemo de suo quidquam affingat, admisceat, aut detrahat, sed simpliciter his Christi verbis, neque ad dexteram neque ad sinistram declinando credat."

† Art. vi. p. 284. Compare Art. xi. p. 300.

“as they easily perceived *that in the Reformation much importance was not attached to strictness in matters of discipline and conduct*, thought they were justified to press, by a new embassy, this subject on Luther’s attention.”* Even the fact, that the Bohemian Brothers constantly retained ecclesiastical celibacy, under the conviction that, thereby, their ministers could, with less impediment, live up to their calling, did not tend to disturb the harmony of the new associates. Subsequently (in the year 1575) the union between the theologians of Wittemberg and the Bohemian Brothers was renewed, yet, without leading to a formal and outward communion, between the two Churches.

However courteous and agreeable Luther might find the Picards (their readiness to embrace his doctrine did not certainly a little contribute to produce this favourable impression), the Austrian government did not experience, from these sectaries, such dispositions towards itself, as to induce it to show them any marks of peculiar favour. In the sect, a deep hatred to the Imperial House continued to glow, and, on every occasion, broke out with the most hostile fury. Hence, its members saw themselves compelled, from time to time, to emigrate; they betook themselves to Poland, where they became acquainted with the peculiar errors of the Reformed, and even with those of the Anabaptists. Even so late as at the commencement of the eighteenth century, the stream of emigration from Bohemia and

* “Thoughts on the Constitution of the Moravian Brothers,” by Francis Buddeus, in Count von Zinzendorf’s smaller writings. Frankfurt on the Main, p. 229, 1740. “The principal work on this period of the Hussites, is Joachimi Camerarii *Historica Narratio de fratrum orthodoxorum Ecclesiis in Bohemiâ, Moraviâ et Poloniâ*,” Heidelberg, 1605.

Moravia still continued to flow. Several emigrants from the latter country settled, in the year 1722, on the estates of Count von Zinzendorf, in Lusatia, and principally at a place called the Hut-berg. Discontented Protestants also, Lutherans, and Calvinists, repaired thither, in order to preserve the freedom of religious worship. The settlement itself was called Herrnhut.

§ LXXIII.—Continuation of the same subject. Spener and the Pietists.

We have now reached the point, where we have to mention a religious movement, among the German Lutherans, a movement, with which the Bohemian Brothers came into immediate contact, and which gave a new shape to their existence. Philip James Spener, born at Rappoltsweiler, in Alsace, in the year 1635, censured, in the theology of his German fellow-religionists, the want of a scriptural basis—a heartless and spiritless attention to mere dead formulas—the absence of all warmth, unction, and interior spirit—and, as a necessary consequence, the most evident sterility in regard to practical life, where he lamented the prevalence of moral laxity and grossness. In the sermons of his day, he found only the successful echo of academical lectures; a polemical violence, dogmatizing dryness, petrifying coldness; an incapacity so to treat the doctrines of faith, as to move the heart and will; and in the great majority of preachers, men who had never experienced the regenerating power of the Gospel, and who did not even hold such to be necessary, in order to draw down a blessing on their announcement of the Divine word; for, as to the calling of a pastor, they en-

tertained totally mistaken notions.* Spener, however, was far from ascribing all the abuses, to a mere accidental error of his time. On the contrary, his unprejudiced judgment and acute perception discovered, in the fundamental doctrines of his Church, a strong occasion to such abuses, although he never openly confessed, that the former necessarily led to the disorders of his age, and, under a self-delusion, even imagined he was only reviving the original maxims of the Reformation. On the nature of faith and its relation to works ; on the reference of both to salvation ; on the possibility of fulfilling the Divine commandments ; on the moral perfection of man, as required by the Gospel, and on the extent and the depth of the purifying and sanctifying power of the Divine Spirit, in the souls of the Faithful ; in like manner, on the relation between nature and grace, and the cooperation of man ; on all these subjects, we say, Spener entertained opinions, which ran directly counter to the principles of the symbolical books, and especially to the errors of Luther.

During his ministry in the cities of Strasburg, Frankfurt, Dresden, and Berlin, Spener, in opposition to that dead, heartless course, above described, followed up his system, with the most abundant success, and in several writings, especially in a work entitled *Pia desideria*, which appeared in the year 1675, he frankly stated his convictions, before all Protestant Germany. Many and influential as were the adversaries he found, who took the Lutheran orthodoxy under their protection ; ho-

* In these and still stronger colours, do Protestants themselves depict those times. Compare the work entitled, " Philip James Spener and his Times," an historical narrative by William Hosbach, evangelical preacher at the Jerusalem Church at Berlin. Berlin, 1828. Part i. p. 1-185.

nourably and openly as the theological faculty of Wittemberg pointed out the contradictions, into which he had fallen, with the fundamental doctrine of his Church, publicly characterising as erroneous the opinion of Spener, that regeneration consisted in the transformation of the whole man, and censuring him, for describing faith without holiness of life, as a deceptive faith, for representing the good works of the true and living believer as perfect, and for declaring absolution from sins, without true and hearty repentance, to be ineffectual, and so forth ; in despite of all these censures, Spener won, ever more and more, on public opinion, and as subsequent events ever more clearly evinced, shook the foundations of Lutheran orthodoxy in Germany.* When Doctor Deutschman

* See Hosbach's "Spener and his Times." Part ii. p. 61 (especially p. 221-232), where the differences between the orthodox Lutherans and Spener, on the point of justification, are explained ; but he will not even concede to the former, the merit of having vindicated the orthodox doctrine of the Lutheran Church. Hosbach will pardon us, if, while we pay a just tribute of acknowledgment to his various learning, his historical art, and his deeper religious feelings, we tell him that he does not accurately understand the Lutheran orthodoxy. Almost all the definitions, which he gives of the doctrines here discussed, are wanting in precision ; so that we are not at all surprised, when he asserts, at p. 229, that the whole controversy is a mere strife of words. But the theologians of Wittemberg, as also Schelwig of Leipzig, knew, very well, that the question turned on things, and not on words. At p. 244, we find, on the question of the necessity of works, a judgment pronounced in favour of Spener, which is expressly condemned by the "Formulary of Concord." At p. 240, the author asserts : "This intemperate zeal led the orthodox theologians to hazard many *strange and utterly untenable* propositions : for instance, as when the Divines of Wittemberg, in contradiction to Spener, said, the Christian cannot at all fulfil the law, and in general, can perform no good works ; whereupon Spener replied, that it was a stigma on the Lutheran

of Wittemberg, together with his colleagues Löscher, Hannecken, and Neumann, censured in so German

Church, to have teachers, who could venture on such an assertion, and thus absolutely to contradict Luther, as well as the Symbolical Books (!); or when these divines dared to put forth the proposition, that the good works of the regenerate were not so much really good, as only less evil than sin itself; or when they called on the Pietists, to prove from Scripture and experience, that any regenerated man has constantly kept himself free from all predominant sins, and when they, at the same time, asserted, that to refrain from all deliberate and mortal sins, during his whole life, was an impossibility even for the regenerated man." These assertions of the orthodox Lutherans are, undoubtedly, when considered from the Scriptural point of view, strange and untenable. But how, on the other hand, within the pale of the Lutheran Church, they can be considered strange and untenable, we are at a loss to understand; nay, it was Spener's doctrine that was there singular and strange, and contrary to the Symbolical writings, on which the whole dispute hinged. Had Spener shaken off the authority of Luther and of the Symbolical books, then indeed, in his controversy with the orthodox theologians, on the above-mentioned questions, he would have had full right on his side; but, as in his defence, he rested on the authority of the former, asserting them to be only erroneously understood by his opponents, he was clearly in the wrong. The accounts of the Protestant Church Historians—Walch, Schröckh, and many others, labour under the same defect, which we here charge on Hossbach.

It was only respecting the Church—the universal priesthood of all believers, and the subjects connected therewith, Spener entertained Luther's earliest principles, as the latter set them forth in his Instruction to the Bohemians. Hence, when the Theological Faculty of Wittemberg, enumerated among Spener's errors the following ones:—namely, "that he regarded the symbolical books as mere human writings, whose authors God indeed preserved from errors, but in which, however, things not conformable to the Divine Word might be found: that he declared believers free from all human authority, in matters of faith; that he held not the Church, but Holy Writ, to be the sole keeper of God's Word, and asserted, that the Church had done well to frame no new symbolical writings;" so it is evident that Spener, in order to justify his own opposition against the Lutheran Church, defended the very same opinions, which Luther proclaimed;

(Deutsch) a manner the doctrines of Spener, their conduct should not have been so ill interpreted. Who was able to show, that they had not endeavoured to uphold the pure doctrine of Luther ?

Doubtless, Spener, that remarkable and meritorious man, had very great defects. Of the inward nature and importance of the Church, he entertained only very confined views, and promoted, in a great degree, a spirit of opposition to all ecclesiastical institutions. However much he insisted on a living faith, rooted in the regenerate will, yet, he threatened it with utter destruction, by diffusing a certain disgust for all definite and settled religious notions, for the enlightenment of the understanding, and by misapprehending the real value of a sound intellectual culture. Hereby, too, he not only introduced the sickly, trifling, sentimentalising spirit of the Pietists, but also prepared the way, for a most pernicious indifference to all dogmas. His views, respecting philosophy and speculative theology, were, in like manner, extremely narrow and illiberal. In Spener's mental cultivation we discover, without doubt, a certain universality, which preserved him, personally, from great aberrations ; but the mystical tendency, which in him

when he unfurled the banner of opposition against the Catholic Church. But, as the Lutheran Church held the system of belief, communicated to it by Luther, as irreformable, (which must ever be the case, so long as *any belief*, however erroneous, exists) ; so Spener departed from the faith of the Church *founded* by Luther ; and when the theologians of Wittemberg urged this charge against him, they were decidedly in the right. In short, here, too, is discernible, that inconsistency, inherent in the very essence of Protestantism, wherein men are to believe indeed, but at the same time not believe, that their belief is infallible ; in other words, that they have absolute and immutable possession of revealed truth. By requiring us to believe in the *fallibility* of our belief, a principle destructive to all faith, is conjoined with it.

was, by far, the most predominant, was rarely transmitted to his disciples, with the counteracting qualifications; and so, among the latter, errors of every kind could not fail to ensue. Lastly, a tincture of an arrogant spirit of sectarianism, is undeniably manifest in Spener. However much he might be in the right, when he characterised the whole Protestant Church, as “the outward, corrupt body,” it did not thence follow, “that one should leave it and bid it adieu,” and be content with gathering together “a little Church within a Church.” It was from this presumptuous view, which was mixed up with his well-meant efforts, that in part proceeded his *Collegia Pietatis*, or associations “of some pious souls” for special edification, which were established, in the year 1670, during his abode at Frankfort, and from which the name of *Pietists* has been derived. These form, without absolutely seceding from the Lutheran Church, a closer association among themselves; and are, with all their one-sided views, their manifold pedantry, their hypocrisy, and often hollow, fantastic, and canting piety, the real salt of that Church.

What more especially characterises the Pietists, is the opinion, which Spener himself, however, impugned; that the true believer must be conscious of the moment wherein his justification (the illapse of grace) has taken place. That it is very easy to perceive this moment, they entertain not the slightest doubt, for, they are of opinion, that every individual must, for once, be afflicted with the anguish of despair at the Divine judgments; whereupon the solace through faith arises, and produces a sense of joy and felicity, that gladdens with super-mundane fulness the heart of man, a sense whereof, previously, he had no anticipation. This opinion may be attended with the worst spiritual con-

sequences. For those, who are not and cannot be conscious of such a moment, as having, in childhood, been blessed with a Christian education, the doctrines of the Gospel have made so deep and vivid an impression on their hearts, that, on one hand, they have ever loved God as the all-merciful, and, on the other, have never been guilty of grievous transgressions ; these, we say, may, on that account, be easily precipitated into an agitation of soul bordering on despair, because these terrors of desperation, and this frightful torment of the conscience, for the violation of the moral law, will not arise ; yet these terrors, and this anguish, are represented as the universal condition to the true peace of the soul, and the joy in God and Christ. Or, should any one, by artificial means, bring on this anguish of the soul, what will be the consequence, but that his whole inward life will be the sport of illusion and self-deception. Who doth not perceive that all these conceptions are only a further developement of the course of justification, traced out by Luther ? His individual experience he exalted into an universal law, and in such a way, indeed, that, for instance, he wrote to Wittemberg, from the castle of Wartburg, on the subject of the Anabaptists, and their new revelations, that they should be examined as to whether they had endured those violent spiritual struggles ; and, on the result of that investigation, he wished to make the recognition of their divine mission, in part at least, depend. If we consider, moreover, that Luther maintained, that it was only on man's return to God, his spiritual organism became again complete, we shall see that his doctrine, necessarily, led to the error, that *every* believer must be able accurately to mark the day, hour, and minute, when his moral renovation took place. With the doc-

trine of an objective communication of grace, through holy baptism, this error is, doubtless, totally incompatible; for the Divine Spirit, once received, cannot, in every instance, remain fruitless in respect to the ulterior progress of man. But, it was precisely such an objective communication of the Spirit, that Luther originally rejected, when he most spoke of these struggles of desperation.

§ LXXIV.—Combination of the doctrinal peculiarities of the Moravians and the Pietists.

In this Pietistic school, and, indeed, in one of its principal seats—in Halle, where the opinions of Spener had been promulgated, from the academic chair—Count Lewis von Zinzendorf,* and his friends, Frederick von Watteville, and Spangenberg, who were the souls, and successively the Bishops, of the Moravian Brethren, assembled in Herrnhut, received, in the leading points at least, their religious education. The one-sided, practical spirit, and the sectarian arrogance, which the above-named leaders and partisans brought, in an equal degree, into the society, formed the element connecting the two parties. The Bohemian Brothers brought a rigid external discipline, as their peculiar characteristic, and Zinzendorf, Watteville, and Spangenberg, “the so-called theology of the cross and blood.” The peculiar

* Respecting Zinzendorf, the reader may consult the very lively, and even impartial sketch of him, which Varnhagen von Ense has traced in his work, entitled *Leben des Grafen von Zinzendorf*. Berlin, 1830. Spangenberg left behind him a large work on Zinzendorf; smaller ones were composed by Reichel and Duvernoy. He was born at Dresden in the year 1700, and died in 1760.

doctrines of the Herrnhutters seem to have been composed of these three elements.

In consequence of the one-sided, practical tendency we have described, and which was common to both parties, Count Zinzendorf was enabled to persuade his vassals, who were divided by many differences in matters of faith, especially by the Moravian, Calvinistic, and Lutheran tenets, to disregard the prevailing diversities of opinion, as they yet agreed in "the fundamental articles," and to induce the Moravian Brothers to follow his advice. Zinzendorf really entertained the notion, that all, who merely believed in redemption, through the blood of Christ, were of one faith, as if this doctrine could even be believed, and maintained unconnected with other dogmas. To remove, however, as far as possible, all injurious consequences and evil reports, he divided his community into three tropes—the Lutheran, the Calvinistic, and the Moravian. With reason did the Lutherans accuse the society of a doctrinal indifference, and assail it on all sides.*

That Zinzendorf also wished to found the community of Herrnhutters, on the basis of sectarian pride, is

* To the well-known judgment of the Faculty of Tübingen on the Herrnhutters, Zinzendorf remarks (p. 205, Collection of his smaller writings): "He (Melancthon) required unity only on the principal articles, and if these principal articles were but once settled, then the matter might be so arranged, that men could bear and communicate, and unite with each other. *But every man will make his own point, forsooth, a secondary point, when he is charged with heresy, and every hæretifex of his opponent's doctrine will make that a fundamental error.*" How productive this idea might have become, had it been only adhered to! The views expressed by Zinzendorf, in regard to Catholics, on occasion of the persecutions he had to endure from the Lutherans, are well entitled to attention.—See his life by Varnhagen, pp. 49, 143, and elsewhere.

proved by many incidents in his life, as well as by the strongest declarations on his part. He, too, looked upon the Lutheran Church, as, on the whole, irrecoverably lost; and all his efforts were directed to the planting, every where, branches of the community of Brothers, into which the yet sound portion of Lutherans might be received, while the by far larger incurable remnant might be suffered to perish. "The Lutheran Church, in his words, was to be so sucked out, unsalted, unspiced, that nothing but a mere skeleton should remain."* Even subscription to the Augsburg Confession he delayed till the year 1748.

In virtue "of the cross and blood theology," (a favourite expression with the Herrnhutters themselves, but which has been ridiculed by modern Protestants, in a very unchristian manner), the disciples of Zinzendorf were, in their public discourses and writings, almost exclusively occupied, with the exposition and meditation on the bloody death of our Redeemer on the cross. The death of Jesus Christ being the centre-point of the Christian faith, the religious discourse of Christians, though not always expressly, should certainly, by implication, ever proceed from, and revert to this cardinal mystery. The Herrnhutters, indeed, represent the great sacrifice of atonement, offered up for us too exclusively, in its immediate, outward form, and do not sufficiently bring out its idea, through the medium of reflection. Wishing to foster sensibility, they strive, too exclusively, to picture the external fact of the crucifixion to the fancy; and thus it cannot fail to happen, that they re-

* Compare Bengel's Life and Ministry. By Frederick Buck, p. 380, Stuttgart, 1831. From p. 276 to 402, the relation of Bengel to the Community of Brothers is very well pointed out.

volve in a very narrow, uniform circle of expressions, and figurative representations, which frequently produce only undefined, hollow, and empty sentiments. It should never, however, have been denied, that from this theology, the Herrnhutters, especially in the first period of their history, which was most obnoxious to censure, derived a moral energy, highly deserving of esteem, and which, in their missionary labours, displays itself under the most favourable aspect. But yet, there were not wanting among them deeper emotions, and beautiful evidences of experience in the interior life, as, to furnish a proof of this, we may appeal to the brief, but very pleasing description, which an uneducated Herrnhutter gives of the inward unção of the spirit.* This theology has, moreover, in its moral influence on ordinary life, produced the most beneficial effects. And how could it be otherwise? Who can meditate with love on the passion of the Saviour, without loving him? And he who loveth him, will keep his commandments. The physical part in our Lord's sufferings forms the substratum, and the point of contact for meditation, with which the believer connects his sorrow for sin, and his sense of gratitude for redemption. Love will not quickly remove from the beloved object, and it dwells, too, with complacency on minute particulars; and, therefore, it argues a profound ignorance of the wants of the human heart, to make it a matter of reproach against the Herrnhutters, that they dwell, with devout contemplation, on the several wounds of the Redeemer, and so forth.† The error consists only herein, that this devo-

* See Zinzendorf's Collected Works, p. 235, et seq.

† The most singular observation of this kind has been recorded by Varnhagen, in his Life of Zinzendorf, p. 283.

tion is too exclusive—that every member of the sect is trained up to these uniform practices of piety—and that a free developement of the peculiarities of different minds, is not encouraged, nay, not even permitted. What an inexhaustible fund for contemplation, doth not the death of our Lord present to the unlearned, as well as to the learned, to the man of tender sensibility, as well as to the severe thinker! Hence, in the Church this wealth reveals itself, according to the different capacities of individuals. But, it is a character proper to sectarianism, to protrude only one side of a mighty whole.

As regards the ecclesiastical discipline of this religious community—the exclusion of irreformable members from its bosom—the separation of the sexes into bands and choirs, even out of the times of divine service—the washing of feet, which is considered something more, than a mere simple function—and other institutions, rites and customs; the description of these appertains not to this place. But, it is worthy of remark, that, in studying the peculiarities of this society, we are often reminded of many phenomena in the early history of the Church. The elections of superintendents by lots, recall to mind the ordeals of the middle age, far more at least than the election of Mathias by the Apostles. The prayers from midnight to midnight, or even during the whole night, once, and perhaps even still, practised by them, remind us of the *Akoimetæ*; and the disgusting and obscene figures of speech, which Zinzendorf indulged in, have a parallel in the practice of the Manicheans, who set forth their opinions by images, drawn even from the nuptial relations. It is worthy of remark, also, that whereas, the sects, which in other countries have grown out of Protestantism,

took a far more spiritual course than the elder and orthodox Protestantism itself, the Herrnhutters, on the contrary, the only sect that in Germany remained permanently separated from the Lutheran Church, adopted a very material form, and even, in the social relations, so subordinated the individual to the community, that all spontaneous movement was paralysed. The society selected even the bride for the bridegroom! In the Catholic Church, all are, in a like degree, subject to the truth, from which no one can nor dare to depart. But, in all other respects, there is the desirable freedom restricted by nothing, save the measures, which are absolutely necessary for the maintenance of truth and of Christian morals. But, among the Herrnhutters, it is precisely in the department of truth, that a delusive freedom is announced—a department, where necessity alone must reign, with unlimited sway.

§ LXXV.—The Methodists. Religious state of England at the beginning of the eighteenth century. Profound degradation of public morals. The Methodists wish to bring about a reform. Comparison between the reforming efforts of Catholics and Protestants, at similar epochs.

The religious fanaticism of the Grand Rebellion in England, pushed even to frenzy, and to the most atrocious crimes, was followed by a period of general spiritual laxity, which, passing through various grades of transition, sank, at last, into the most frivolous unbelief. England had seen a Parliament which furnished a proof that an excess of distempered religious feelings can be as deeply revolting to God and to reason, involving even the crime of regicide, as the absence of all religious principles. That Parliament had been succeeded

by another, whose illegal convocation Cromwell dared to justify, by the pretended interference of an immediate Divine agency ; a Parliament which, to the opening speech of the deceitful fanatic, bore testimony “that, from the very tone in which it was spoken, it might be inferred, that the Holy Ghost worked within him ;” and, which opened its deliberations with religious solemnities of its own device, whereat the members confessed that “they were filled with a peace and joyfulness, and had a sense of the presence of, and an inmost fellowship, with Jesus Christ, such as they had never before experienced.”* This period of fanaticism was followed by a generation, in whose higher circles, the principles of a Shaftesbury ever gained ground ; and a state of morals prevailed, which Fielding has depicted in his *Tom Jones*. The populace, which had recruited the Cromwellian army with preachers, enthusiasts, seers, and prophets ; that had rejected an established ministry, as totally unnecessary, and as destructive to evangelical freedom ; lay now as deeply buried in the mire, as it had been previously exalted into a dizzy elevation. The Anglican clergy, on the one hand, despised, and, therefore, repelled by the blind and excited people, had, on the other hand, learned little from their

* Villemain, *histoire de Cromwell d'après les mémoires du temps et les recueils Parlémentaires*. Bruxelles, 1831, tom. xi. p. 6. Of Cromwell's opening speech to the Parliament of 1655, Villemain says :—“C'est une espèce de sermon, rempli du nom de Dieu, et de citations de l'Ecriture. Il exhorte les députés à être fidèles avec les Saints, et les félicite d'être avoués par Jesus Christ, et d'avouer Jesus Christ. C'étoit une adresse assez remarquable d'éluder ainsi l'élection populaire par la vocation divine, et de flatter cette assemblée au nom de ce qu'il avoit d'illégal et d'inusité dans sa réunion, etc.” The Appendix to Villemain's first volume (pp. 329-332), will give the reader full insight into Cromwell's artful character.

times of persecution. All enthusiasm, life, activity, deep conviction of the magnitude of their calling, remained, for the most part, ever alien from their minds and habits; so that, on the whole, they looked with a stupid, indifferent eye on the ever-growing depravity.*

During the long period of her existence, the Catholic Church has, not unfrequently, had to suffer from like disorders in her clergy. But, it hath ever pleased the Lord to raise up men, endued with sufficient courage and energy, to strike terror, and infuse new life, into a torpid priesthood, as well as into a degenerate people. According to the different character of different times, the mode of their rise and action was different; but, the conviction was universal, that mere laws and ordinances, under such circumstances, were fruitless; and only living, practical energy was capable of infusing new life into an age diseased. On the one hand, we see numerous individuals, at the instigation of the heads of the Church, who were acquainted with their powers of energetic persuasion, travel about as preachers in remote districts, awakening, among high and low, a sense of their misery, and stirring up the desire for deliverance from sin; or, on the other hand, we behold founders of mighty orders arise, whose members made it their duty to undertake the instruction of the people, or their moral resuscitation (two very different things), or both these offices together, neglected, as they had been, by the ordinary pastors. Happy for the Church, if its episcopacy, misled by a partial feeling of grati-

* See Dr. Southey's *Life of Wesley*. In vol. i. p. 261 (German translation), he gives an interesting picture of the times, in order to account for the spread of Methodism. We find there little else to blame, except his ignorance of the history of the Catholic Church, and his vain attempt to exculpate the Anglican.

tude for the services of such communities, in the time of their bloom and strength, had not prolonged their existence, when they were become morally dead, and were scarcely susceptible of renovation. As new orders sprang up, most of the elder ones were ordinarily forced to disappear.

The end, which several of the smaller Protestant sects, and particularly the Methodists, proposed to themselves, was nearly the same as that, which led to the origin of the monastic institutes adverted to. It appears even, not unworthy of attention, that, precisely at the time, when the Pietists were rapidly gaining ground, and Zinzendorf, as well as the founder of methodism, were flourishing; there arose in the Catholic Church a less celebrated indeed, but not less active, and, (as regards the religious life of Italy), not less influential personage,—I mean St. Alphonsus Liguori, a native of the Neapolitan territory, who took compassion on the neglected people, and devoted himself to their religious and moral culture.* The important distinction, however, is not to

* See Jeancard, *Vie du Bienheureux Alphonse Liguori, évêque de Ste. Agathe de Goths, et fondateur de la Congrégation des Prêtres Missionnaires du très saint Redempteur*. Louvain, 1829. Born in the year 1696, of an old and noble family, Alphonsus Liguori was ordained priest in 1726. Touched with the deepest compassion at the sight of the Lazzaroni, he united himself with other ecclesiastics, in order to devote his energies to the care of this neglected multitude. He founded pious congregations, which still subsist, and at present amount at Naples to the number of seventy-five, each consisting of one hundred and thirty to one hundred and fifty persons. (See p. 47-51.) During a residence in the country, he discovered the rude and utterly neglected condition of the peasantry. “L’abandon presque général,” says Jeancard, “dans lequel Alphonse eut alors occasion de reconnoître que vivaient les habitans des campagnes, le toucha d’un sensible chagrin; il lui en resta une impression profonde, dont la Providence, qui la lui

be overlooked, that such Catholic institutes spring from the conviction, that the spirit of the Church only is to be infused into individuals, or to be carefully awakened and cherished; while the above-named sects, in a greater or a less degree, ever assailed the fundamental doctrines of the religious community, out of which they arose, and strove to set the same aside. The origin of Protestantism itself is here felt; for, as the Reformers acted against the Catholic Church, so the community, founded by them, was, in turn, treated by its own children in the like manner. The want of reverence towards father and mother (for such is the Church to us in a spiritual relation), is transmitted from generation to generation; and the wicked spirit, that first raised the son up against his father, goes out of the son as soon as he becomes a parent, and, in turn, goads his offspring on to wreak bloody vengeance upon him.

The man, upon whose heart the spiritual misery of the English people, at the commencement of the eighteenth century, had made a deep impression, was John Wesley,

avait ménagée, se servait dans la suite pour l'exécution des grands desseins dont elle voulait que ce digne ouvrier évangélique fut l'instrument."—P. 82. He now founded an Order, which was destined to meet these crying wants. The idea which led to its establishment, is this: it usually happens that the ordinary ministry of souls, though not conducted badly, is yet carried on in a dull and drowsy fashion. With the priest, the parishes, too, slumber. Hence, from time to time, an extraordinary religious excitement and resuscitation are very desirable, which then the local clergy can keep up. This extraordinary religious excitement the missions, undertaken by the Redemptionists, are designed to produce. From the same views, an English Parliament once wished to do away entirely with all stationary clergymen. They were all to be constantly changing residence, in order that the parishes might receive new ones, and thus be kept in a constant state of life and excitement. This was another extreme.

distinguished, beyond doubt, by great talents, classical acquirements, and, (what was still better), by a burning zeal for the kingdom of God. Rightly doth his biographer say, that, in other times and under other circumstances, he would have been the founder of a religious order, or a reforming pope. With his brother Charles, and some others,—among whom the eloquent, gentle, kind-hearted, but in every respect far less gifted, Whitfield, soon became eminent,—John Wesley, from the year 1729, lived at Oxford, as a student and assistant teacher, devoted to the most rigid ascetic exercises, and careless, as was right, about the remarks of the world. From the strict observance of a pious method of life, which evinced itself, in the promotion of an interior spirit, the pious association obtained, at first in a well-meant sense, and then by way of ridicule, the name of Methodists, which then became generally attached to them.*

§ LXXVI.—Peculiar doctrines of the Methodists. Marks of distinction between them and the Herrnhutters. Division of the sect into Wesleyans and Whitfieldites.

Still holding to the Thirty-nine Articles of the Anglican Church, and fully retaining its liturgy and constitution, the Methodists, at first, propagated through smaller circles, out of Oxford, only their ascetic practices, their fasts, their hours of prayer, their Bible-readings, and their frequent communions. Their mode

* Southey, vol. i. p. 49. "They were sometimes called, in ridicule, Sacramentarians, Bible-canters, Bible-moths, and even the Holy Club. A certain individual, who, by his knowledge and religious feelings, rose superior to the multitude, observed, in reference to the *methodical*, regular mode of life of these despised men, that a new sect of *Metho ists* had sprung up." Allusion was here made to a medical school of that name.

of teaching, at first, differed from the ordinary one, only by the great stress they laid on moral perfection, which they held to be possible to the regenerated. The energy and enthusiasm of their sermons, delivered, as they were, from the pulpits of the Anglican Church, attracted, in a very short time, crowds of auditors ; so that, encouraged by success, they soon selected the open fields, for the theatre of their exertions, and, indeed, principally such places as had been the scene of every sensual excess.

The acquaintance of John Wesley with some Herrnhutters, principally with David Nitschmann, whom, as a fellow-passenger on a voyage out to America, his brother Charles had, in the year 1735, learned to know and esteem ; then his connexion with Spangenberg—his visit to the Herrnhut communities in Germany and Holland, occasioned a new epoch in the history of his interior life. He became acquainted with the doctrine, that after the previous convulsive feelings, the clearest consciousness of grace before God, accompanied with a heavenly, inward peace, must suddenly arise in the soul ; and this doctrine obtained, for a long time at least, his fullest conviction. Yet it was only some years after, he was favoured with such a moment, and (as he himself declares) on the 29th May, 1739, in Aldersgate-street, London, at a quarter before nine o'clock. How, amid such violent, inward emotions, the time could be so accurately observed, the striking of the clock heard, or the watch attended to, is, indeed, marvellous to conceive ! This genuine Lutheran doctrine was, thenceforward, embraced with peculiar ardour, was everywhere preached up, and never failed to be attended with sudden conversions. The impressive eloquence of Whitfield, especially, was very successful in bringing

about such momentary changes of life, that were, very frequently, accompanied with convulsive fits, the natural results of an excessive excitement of the imagination, among a people, for the greater part, totally ignorant, and deeply deluded. Phenomena of this kind were called "the outward signs of grace," and were even held to be miracles.* The pulpits of the Established Church were refused to the enthusiasts and fanatics, as the Methodists were now called; and, thereby, the occasion was afforded to the latter, to constitute themselves into an independent body. Wesley now raised himself to the episcopal dignity, and ordained priests: a pretended Greek bishop, called Erasmus, then residing in England, was also solicited to impart holy orders. The separation from the Anglican Church was now formally proclaimed, and the most strenuous opposition commenced.†

The friendly relations between the Herrnhutters and the Methodists were also soon disturbed. A weighty cause for this, as Southey justly observes, was, doubt-

* Southey relates, in vol. ii. p. 478 (German translation), that the teachers of a Methodist Latin school at Kingswood, would not permit boys, of from seven to eight years of age, to have any rest, "until they had obtained a clear feeling of the pardoning love of God." The poor children were driven to the verge of insanity; and, at last, the inward despairing contrition arose, and thereupon the full consciousness of Divine grace ensued! Wesley, who was himself present at this act of extreme folly in Kingswood, approved of and encouraged it. Of course, in a very short time, no trace of any such a regeneration was any longer to be discerned; and hereupon Wesley testifies his astonishment in the following passage: "I passed an hour among the children at Kingswood. Strange enough! What is become of the wonderful work of grace, which God, last September, wrought among the boys? It is gone! It is vanished!" &c. &c.

† Yet subsequently there were Methodists, again, who adhered to the Established Church.

less, to be looked for in the fact, that neither Zinzendorf nor Wesley were disposed to hold a subordinate position, one to the other; and two chiefs could not be honoured in the same community. But, there also existed strong internal motives for this opposition, and they were the two following. In the first place, according to the Herrnhutters, all prayer, all Bible-reading, all benevolent actions prior to regeneration—that is to say, prior to the occurrence of the above described turning point in life, are not only fruitless, but even deadly poison;—a doctrine, indeed, often put forth by Luther, but which Wesley rightly held to be untrue in itself, and productive of the most fatal consequences. An English Herrnhutter, or Moravian Brother, said, that for twenty years he had faithfully observed all the ecclesiastical precepts, but had never found Christ. But hereupon having become disobedient, he immediately contracted as intimate an union with Christ, as that which joins the arms to the body.* The second stumbling-block, in the way of union, was on the part of the Methodists. They taught, that, by the evangelical perfection, which the regenerate possess, a moral condition is to be understood, wherein even all the irregular motions of concupiscence—every involuntary impulse of sensuality stimulating to evil, are utterly unknown. Against such a doctrine the Herrnhutters protested with reason; and Spangenberg replied as follows: “So soon,” says he, “as we are justified (or taken into favour by God), a new man awakes within us. But, the old man abideth, even to the day of our death; and in this old man remaineth the old, corrupt heart. But, the heart of the new man is clean,

* Southey, vol. i. p. 309. Compare an equally remarkable passage in p. 313.

and the new man is stronger than the old; so that, albeit corrupt Nature ever continues to struggle, it can never conquer, as long as we can retain our eyes fixed upon Christ.”* The form of this reply has undoubtedly much, that is objectionable; for, we are expressly required to put off the old man, and to put on the new one. The same idea is also expressed by the words, “new birth,” “new creation,” and the like; hence, we are to have not two hearts, but only one. But, on the other hand, this reply to the Methodists, is, in substance, perfectly correct; although the degrees, in the life of the regenerate, are not minutely traced, the setting forth whereof might have rendered possible a reconciliation between the Methodists and the Herrnhutters. That Spangenberg, too, should, in so unqualified a manner, have represented the new man, as being able to conquer, and the regenerated, as really triumphing in the struggle against the incentives to grievous sin, proves the great revolution of opinion, which Spener had brought about in the Lutheran Church, and wherein the Herrnhutters had also taken part.

The controversy adverted to, divided, also, Wesley and Whitfield. The latter, like the Herrnhutters, combated the exaggerated views of the former, respecting the perfection of the regenerate, and, in this respect chose the better part; but, on another point, Wesley defended the truth against Whitfield. The latter was a partisan of the most rigid predestinarianism, which the former classed among the most abominable opinions, that had ever sprung up in a human head, and which could by no means be tolerated. In this way, not only did the mutual approximation between the Herrnhutters

* Southey, vol. i. p. 317. Zinzendorf's Exaggerations, p. 321.

and the Methodists fail of terminating, in the desired union, but, the one sect of Methodists broke into two, that opposed each other, with bitter animosity.

These sectaries, however, by their mode of reasoning with each other, excite in the mind the most painful feelings. It is not without a sense of insuperable disgust, that we see Spangenberg appeal against Wesley *to his own experience*, and that of the other Herrnhutters ; whence, nothing else could be inferred, than that *they* had such particular experiences, but by no means, that such things must so be. The Wesleyans, in their turn, brought forward men and women, who appealed to *their own* experience, and thence proved that the regenerate no longer perceive, in themselves, the disorderly motions of sensuality, and are in every respect free from sin or even failing.* The most egotistical exaltation of oneself, to be a pattern to all, meets us here in its most repulsive, appalling form, against which the slightest spark of shame, we should think, would rise up, and kindle into a flame. Lastly, Whitfield, too, came forward with a shocking arrogance, denominated by him humility, and appealed to his inward experiences, in proof of the theory of absolute predestination.†

* Southey, vol. i. p. 318.

† Southey, vol. i. p. 337. "Pardon me," wrote Whitfield to Wesley, "that I exhort you, in humility, no longer to resist, with this boldness, the doctrine of election, since you yourself confess, that you have not the testimony of the Spirit within you, and are thus no competent judge in this matter. This living testimony, God several years ago granted to me; and I stand up for election.....Oh! I have never read a syllable of Calvin's writings; *my* doctrine I have from Christ and His apostles; God himself hath announced it to me; as it pleased Him to send *me* out first, and to enlighten me first, so I hope he gives me now also the light." The separation of the two occurred in the year 1740.

The prevalence of Antinomian principles, even among the Wesleyan Methodists was of very important consequence. Wesley distinguished between justification and sanctification, although he allowed both to take place, at the same moment. But, in despite of an asserted inward connexion, between the two things, the mere assumption, that Divine Grace could be annexed to any other principle, in our spiritual life, than that whereby man manifests his obedience unto God, necessarily led to a contempt of the law ; so that, even here also, the doctrine that man is justified by faith only, betrays its essentially Antinomian character. The following account, coming, as it does, from a quarter perfectly friendly to the Methodists, cannot lie under the suspicion of misrepresentation. Fletcher,—a very remarkable, active, and amiable disciple of Wesley,—says, in his *Checks to Antinomianism* ; “ Antinomian principles have spread like wildfire among our societies. Many persons, speaking in the most glorious manner of Christ, and their interest in his complete salvation, have been found living in the grossest immoralities. How few of our societies, where cheating, extorting, or some other evil, hath not broke out, and given such shakes to the Ark of the Gospel, that, had not the Lord interposed, it must have been overset ! I have seen them, who pass for believers, follow the strain of corrupt nature ; and when they should have exclaimed against Antinomianism, I have heard *them cry out against the legality of their wicked hearts*, which they said, *still suggested, that they were to do something for their salvation*,” (that is to say, the voice of their conscience ever cried out against their immoral conduct ; but, they held that voice to be a temptation of Satan, who wished to derogate from the power of faith). “ How few of our cele-

brated pulpits," continues Fletcher, "where more has has not been said *for sin*, than *against it*!"

Fletcher cites the Methodist Hill in particular, as asserting, "That even adultery and murder do not hurt the pleasant children, but rather work for their good: God sees no sin in believers, whatever sins they may commit. My sins may displease God, my person is always acceptable to Him. Though I should outsin Manasses, I should not be less a pleasant child, because God always views me in Christ. Hence, in the midst of adulteries, murders, and incests; He can address me with, 'thou art all fair, my love, my undefiled; there is no spot in thee.' It is a most pernicious error of the schoolmen, to distinguish sins according to the fact, not according to the person. Although I highly blame those who say, 'let us sin, that grace may abound,' yet adultery, incest, and murder, shall, upon the whole, make me holier on earth, and merrier in heaven;" that is to say, the more I need the pardoning grace of God, the stronger becomes my faith, the holier I become.*

John Wesley was extremely concerned at the spread of such opinions. He therefore summoned a Conference, in the year 1770, which took into deliberation the principles, hitherto professed by the Methodists, and justly acknowledged, that all the evil entirely originated in the opinion, that Christ has abolished the moral law; that believers are thus not bound to its observance; and that Christian liberty dispenses them from keeping the Divine Commandments. The following remarks of Wesley, at the same conference, as to the merit of

* See Fletcher's Checks to Antinomianism, vol. ii. pp. 22, 200, 215. Works; vol. iii. p. 50; vol. iv. p. 97. Compare Dr. Milner's End of Religious Controversy, Letter vi.

works, to which he was by necessity urged, are well entitled to attention. "Take heed to your doctrine! We have leaned too much towards Calvinism. With regard to *man's faithfulness*: our Lord himself taught us to use the expression, and we ought never to be ashamed of it. 2. With regard to *working for life*: this also our Lord has expressly commanded us. Labour, ἐργαξέδε, literally, *work for the meat that endureth to everlasting life*. 3. We have received it as a maxim, that a man is to do nothing *in order to* justification. Nothing can be more false. Whoever desires to find favour with God, should *cease from evil, and learn to do well*. Whoever repents, should do *works meet for repentance*. And if this is not in order to find favour, what does he do them for? Is not this salvation by works? Not by the *merit* of works, but by works as a *condition*. What have we then been disputing about, for these thirty years? I am afraid, *about words*. As to *merit* itself, of which we have been so dreadfully afraid, we are rewarded *according to our works*, yea, *because of our works*. How does this differ from *for the sake of our works*? And how differs this from *secundum merita operum*, as our works deserve? Can you split this hair? I doubt I cannot." * Wesley was evidently very near the truth. Thus much as to the peculiarities of the Methodists, so far as they fall within the scope of the present inquiry.

We shall conclude with observing, that the Methodists have acquired great merit by the instruction, and the religious and moral reform, of rude and deeply degraded classes of men; as for instance, the colliers of Kingswood, and the negro slaves in America. Their

* Southey, vol. ii. p. 366.

wild way of preaching, which is not entirely the result of *their* doctrines, has evinced its fitness for the obtuse intellect and feelings of auditors, who could only be roused to some sort of life, by a violent method of terrifying the imagination. It is worthy of remark, that on one occasion, to a minister, who declared it impossible to convert a drunkard, and who said, that at least no example of such a conversion had ever come to his knowledge, Wesley replied, that in his society, there were many converts of that kind. There are certain moral and intellectual capacities and conditions, which only a certain style of preaching suits; and on which every other makes no impression. Hence, it is to be considered a great misfortune, when, in any place, all things are modelled after a uniform plan. This is to render the Spirit at once inaccessible and inoperative, for many preachers and many descriptions of people; for, the Spirit delighteth, at times, even in eccentric forms.

CHAPTER IV.

THE DOCTRINE OF SWEDENBORG.*

§ LXXVII.—Some preliminary historical Remarks.

ONE of the most mysterious phenomena in history, is the director of mines, Emanuel Swedenborg, the son of a Swedish bishop, and who departed this life in the year 1772. He was, on one hand, distinguished for acuteness of intellect, and for a wide range of knowledge,—particularly in the mathematics and the natural sciences, which he cultivated with great success, as is evinced by many writings, highly prized in his day ; and on the other hand, he was noted for his full conviction, that he held intercourse with the world of spirits, whereby he believed that he obtained information on all matters in anywise claiming the attention of the religious man. He imagined himself to be transported into heaven, and to be there favoured, with oral instructions by the Deity and His angels, as to the Divine essence—the emanation of the world from God—the purport of the Divine revelations, and the consummation of the Church—the nature of heaven and hell, and many other things.

Professor von Görres has, in his work, entitled, “ Emanuel Swedenborg, his visions, and his relations to

* This article I inserted in the fourth number of the *Quarterly Review of Tübingen*, for the year 1830. It appears here with only a few alterations and additions.

the Church," and likewise in his Introduction to the writings of Henry Suso, newly edited by Diepenbrock, very convincingly proved, that, from the very high character of this visionary, acknowledged by his contemporaries to be pure and blameless, the idea of intentional deceit, on his part, cannot be at all entertained; and that his ecstasies may best be explained by animal magnetism. As I am unacquainted with the nature of this latter science, I must abstain from offering any opinion on the matter; particularly, as the object of this inquiry demands no elucidation of Swedenborg's psychological state. We are here merely engaged with his peculiar doctrinal and ecclesiastical views, and will leave out of question his theosophistical, cosmogonic, and other like theories; for, these form no part of the tenets of faith constituting the New Church. These doctrines we shall now set forth, chiefly as they are stated in his last writing, published shortly prior to his death, and entitled: "True Christian Religion, containing the Universal Theology of the New Church."*

The relation, wherein Swedenborg placed himself in regard to the new community he founded, is the first thing which claims our attention. He considers himself, not only to be a restorer of primitive Christianity, and to be a divine envoy, in the same comprehensive sense, as Luther; but, he was under the firm conviction, that he had, in the most solemn way, been commissioned by God in heaven, to introduce a new and imperishable era in the Church. The second coming of the Lord,

* "True Christian Religion; containing the Universal Theology of the new Church." By Emanuel Swedenborg, servant of the Lord Jesus Christ. Translated from the original Latin work, printed at Amsterdam, in the year 1771, vol. ii. 5th edition. London: 1819. The Latin original I have not been able to procure.

which is promised in the Gospel, was to take place in him. Not that he held himself to be an incarnation of the Deity; on the contrary, he taught that God could no more appear in a human form, and that the foretold second advent of the Lord must be interpreted, as only the general and victorious establishment of His truth and love among men—as His manifestation in the word. This consummation of the Christian Church, he calls the new heaven and the new earth, the new celestial Jerusalem, whereof the Scripture speaketh.* This new kingdom of God on earth began, according to Swedenborg, on the 19th June, 1770;—precisely the very day after the termination of the work, from which we have taken the above statements, and which was to go forth into all the world, and win over the elect. For, as soon as, according to our authority, the last words of this book were written down, Jesus Christ sent his apostles throughout the whole spiritual world, to announce to the same the glad tidings, that henceforth He, whose kingdom hath no end, shall reign for ever and ever; and all this, in order that what stands written in Daniel (vii. 13, 14); and in Revelations (xi. 15), might be fulfilled. The aforesaid mission of the apostles, was also foretold in Matthew (xxiv. 31).†

* Loc. cit. vol. ii. p. 502.

† Loc. cit. p. 547. “After this work was finished, the Lord called together His twelve disciples, who followed him in the world; and the next day He sent them throughout the whole spiritual world to preach the Gospel, that the Lord Jesus Christ reigneth, whose kingdom shall endure for ever and ever, according to the prophecy in Daniel, c. vii. 13, 14; and in the Revelations, c. xi. 15; and that they are blessed, who come to the marriage supper of the Lamb.”—Revel. xix. 9. This was done on the 19th day of June, in the year 1770.

§ LXXVIII.—Practical tendency of Swedenborg.—His judgment on the Reformers, and his account of their destiny in the next life.

The doctrinal system of the Swedish prophet has by no means, as we should be disposed to believe from many of his speculations, a mainly theosophistic tendency, but, on the contrary, an eminently practical one. It sprung out of an opposition to the Protestant principle of justification, and the ulterior doctrines therewith connected; for, Swedenborg also held this whole body of Lutheran and Calvinistic tenets to be subversive of morality, and extremely pernicious to practical Christianity. From this polemical spirit, all the virtues and the defects of this sectary are to be deduced. That such is really the case, is manifest from the very great and unwearied attention, which, in lengthened portions of his writings, he devoted to the consideration of the above-mentioned doctrines of the Reformers, as well as from the fact, that on every occasion, and when we least expect, he recurs to the subject, and sets forth the pernicious influence of these errors, on moral and religious life. Swedenborg is wont to support his peculiar tenets, by an appeal to the immediate teaching of the higher spirits, wherewith he had been favoured. Hence, to the several articles of doctrine he affixes an appendix, wherein he gives a description of these celestial conferences, often with great minuteness, and entering into many subordinate circumstances. But, none of his doctrinal views does he uphold by such numerous visions, as that of his hostility to the Protestant doctrine of Justification.*

* For instance, vol. i. p. 314, 317, 647, 649; vol. ii. p. 80, 92, 100, 169.

Angels inform the visionary, that not faith alone, but together with the same, charity also justifies and saves. In proof of this, he relates the substance of a dialogue heard by him, and which occurred between some angels and several Protestants, who had arrived in the other world. To the most various questions the latter constantly replied, that for them faith must supply the place of all things, and hence they received the final sentence,—that they were like an artist, who could play but one tune, and therefore showed themselves unworthy of the society of superior spirits. In contrast with this, the following conversation between angels, and some other new-comers from this world, is given. “What signifies Faith? To believe what the Word of God teacheth. What is charity? To practise what that word teacheth. Hast thou believed only what thou hast read in the word, or hast thou acted also according to it? I have also acted according to it. My friend, come with us, and take up thy dwelling in the midst of us.” With Luther and Melancthon, also, Swedenborg, in his celestial travels, made acquaintance, and he gives us the following account of them. Luther (when Swedenborg visited the spiritual kingdom), was not in heaven, but in a sort of purgatory—an intermediate place, where attempts for his improvement were practised on him. When Luther, we are further told, arrived in the next world, he found himself in a locality, which Swedenborg honoured with a visit, and which perfectly resembled his domicile in Wittenberg. With the greatest self-complacency, Luther collected around him all his disciples and adherents, as they successively entered into the spiritual kingdom, and in proportion as they had evinced more zeal and penetration in defence of his doctrine, he honoured them with a seat

nearer to himself, as their leader. With the greatest enthusiasm, and firmest confidence, Luther was incessantly setting forth his doctrine of Justification by faith alone, before this circle, when he was suddenly disturbed by the information, that that doctrine was thoroughly false, and, that if he wished to enter into beatitude, he must utterly renounce it. For a long time he would not yield, until at last he began to doubt, whether he were in the truth. Swedenborg, on his departure, received from an angel the consolatory assurance, that Luther seemed really to perceive his errors, and afforded every hope of a thorough amendment. Swedenborg assigns the following reason for this. Before the beginning of his Reformation, Luther was member of a Church, which exalts charity above faith. Educated in this doctrine from infancy, he was so thoroughly imbued with it, that, though without a clear consciousness of it, it ever regulated his inward spiritual life; and, on this account, even after he had declared war against the Catholic Church, he was enabled to give such excellent instruction in respect to charity. His own doctrine of Justification by Faith alone, on the other hand, so little set aside the conviction of his youthful days, that it belonged more to his external, than internal man.* It was otherwise with his dis-

* Vol. ii. p. 553. "I was informed by the examining angels, that this chieftain of the Church is in a state of conversion, far before many others, who have confirmed themselves in the doctrine of Justification by faith alone; and that, because in his youthful days, before he began his work of Reformation, he had received a strong tincture of the doctrine, which maintains the pre-eminence of charity: this was the reason, why, both in his writings and sermons, he gave such excellent instruction in regard to charity; and hence, it came to pass, that the faith of Justification with him, was implanted in his external natural man, but not rooted in his internal spiritual man."

ciples, who had been confirmed in his doctrine. As an illustrative instance, he recounts the destinies, which, after his death, befell Melanchthon. He, too, was no inhabitant of heaven :—on the contrary, he must previously abandon his opinions respecting Justification by faith alone, before he can enter into eternal life. Philip Melanchthon was seen by Swedenborg, as he was zealously engaged in the composition of a book ; but, he was unable to make any progress in his work. He was ever writing down the words : “ Faith alone saves ;” when the words as often again disappeared. The reason of this phenomenon is, that they are utterly devoid of truth, and in the next world no error can endure. All attempts to bring this Reformer to a better way of thinking, have hitherto failed. On one occasion, indeed, he wrote down the proposition, “ Faith together with charity, justifies ;” but, as that proposition did not spring out of the inmost feelings of his soul, but had only been taught him, it could be attended with no success. In vain we seek for an assurance, that Melanchthon, too, could look forward to a termination of his painful state ; Calvin experiences a still worse fate, because he was always, as Swedenborg says, a sensual man ; and, beside the Lutheran doctrine of Justification, maintained also the revolting error of an absolute and eternal predestination of some to beatitude, and of others, to damnation. Swedenborg saw him, on that account, thrown down into a pit, filled with the most abominable spirits.

The Catholics, too, according to our seer, must, in many respects change their convictions, before they can quit the immediate state in the next life, and enter into a higher sphere. Strangely prejudiced, however, as Swedenborg is, against the Catholic Church—ill as he

is wont to speak about popes, bishops, and saints, he yet communicates the information, that if Catholics perform works of charity only in simplicity, and think more of God than of the pope, their transition to pure truth, and thereby to eternal felicity, is as easy, “as it is to enter into a temple, when the doors are thrown open; or, into a palace, by passing between the sentinels, who keep guard in the outer courts, when the king enjoins admission; or, as it is to lift up the countenance and look toward heaven, when angelic voices are heard therein.”*

Evident, as it now is, that Swedenborg’s reforming zeal was particularly directed against the errors in the Protestant doctrine of Justification; yet, his attempts to undermine the same, were conducted with a destructive ignorance; for he undermined withal, the very foundations of Christianity. Looking for the connexion, wherein the notion of faith, as prevalent among his former fellow-religionists, stood with other dogmas, he fell into the error, that the doctrine of the Trinity was the basis of the former opinion, and hence, he thought it incumbent upon him to subvert it. Secondly, he observes (and in this instance with perfect justice), that the Lutheran and Calvinistic doctrine of original sin, forms the ground-work of the Protestant theory of Justification. He rejected, accordingly, the article of the fall of man in Adam; and human freedom, which the Reformers had denied, he exalted to the highest pitch. Lastly, he assailed the doctrine of the vicarious death of Christ, in order to cut off the last link, which could connect the notion of Justification, by faith alone, with any other dogma. A nearer inves-

* Vol. ii. p. 578.

tigation of these three points will, therefore, be our next task.

§ LXXIX.—Swedenborg's doctrine on the Trinity.—His motive for assailing that of the Church.

The connexion, which Swedenborg established between the dogma of the Trinity, and the Protestant doctrine of Justification, attacked by him with such extreme vehemence, is as follows:—"After men had discovered three persons in the Deity, they were forced to allot to each a separate office. The first Person, accordingly, was regarded as the One which had been offended by mankind; and the second, was considered to be the Mediator. By the establishment of so powerful a mediation, the Father has been involved in the necessity of bestowing unconditional pardon; that is to say, without regard to moral worthiness, through faith in the merits of the Son alone.* In order to prevent the possibility of the very idea of such an intercession, the new Reformer turned against the doctrine of the Trinity itself, and, indeed, with that decided hos-

* Vol. i. p. 255. "That this idea concerning redemption and concerning God, pervades the faith, which prevails, at this day, throughout all Christendom, is an acknowledged truth; for, that faith requires man to pray to God the Father, that He would remit their sins, for the sake of the cross and the blood of His Son, and to God the Son, that He would pray and intercede for them; and to God the Holy Ghost, that He would justify and sanctify them, &c." Vol. ii. p. 319. "Since a mental persuasion of three Gods has been the result, it was impossible for any other system of faith to be conceived or formed, but what was applicable to those three Persons, in their respective stations; as for instance, that God the Father ought to be approached, and implored to impute the righteousness of His Son, or to be merciful for the sake of His Son's suffering on the cross, &c."

tility, which, whenever a dogma is assailed from a practical point of view, is ever wont to arise. Swedenborg says, the falsity of the doctrine of three Divine Persons, is clear from the fact, that the angels, with whom he held intercourse, declared to him, that it was impossible for them to designate in words that opinion, and that if any one approached them, with the intention of giving utterance to it, he was compelled to turn away from them; and that if he really uttered the opinion, he was immediately transformed into a block in human shape. A man, who seriously, and with full conviction professes the Church doctrine of the Trinity, he compares, in consequence, to a statue with moveable limbs; in whose interior Satan lodges, and speaks by its artificial mouth. The old Christian faith in a Triune God, he, accordingly, places on a level with Atheism; for there is not, in fact, he says, a God-head with three Persons, or, as he expresses himself, there are not three Gods.*

He teaches, on his part, that in the Divinity there is but one Person, the Jehovah God (probably the Jehovah Elohim) of the Old Testament. The same hath in Christ assumed human nature; and the energy of this God-Man, that is ever working for our renovation, is the Holy Ghost, whom Swedenborg calls the Divine Truth, and the Divine Power, which worketh the regeneration, renovation, vivification, sanctification, and justification of man. Hence, he adopts, indeed, a Trinity of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; but in his language, he explains it to be three objects of one subject, or three attributes

* Vol. i. p. 46 ... p. 339. "The present faith of the Church is a faith in three Gods."—Compare p. 45, p. 335.

of one Divine Person.* In other words, he conceives the Trinity, to be three different manifestations of one and the same Divine Person, who, in the Father, reveals Himself as Creator of the world, in the Son as the Redeemer, and in the Spirit as the Sanctifier. He refers, moreover, the expression, "Son of God," to the humanity, which Jehovah assumed, and then compares the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, with the soul and body, and the operations of man, resulting from the union of the two.†

Of what is called Scriptural proof, Swedenborg has not the slightest notion. It is a mere accident, if in support of any one, even of his truest propositions, he assigns satisfactory exegetical grounds. He usually heaps passages upon passages, without much troubling himself about usage of speech, the context, parallel passages, or in general, the strict application of hermeneutic rules, although with these, he was not unacquainted. It is so in the matter under discussion. Let any one only read the passages he cites from Isaiah, Jeremiah, Osee, and the Psalms, in order to prove, that it was not the Son begotten of the Father from all eternity, but he, whom he calls Jehovah, that became Man and Redeemer; and, such a one must be convinced, that with a like course of reasoning, any con-

* Loc. cit. p. 327. "Hence, then it is evident, that there is a Divine Trinity, consisting of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. But, in what sense this Trinity is to be understood, whether as consisting of three Gods, who in essence, and consequently in name, are one God, or, as three objects of one subject, and thus that what are so named, are only the qualities, or attributes of one God: human reason, if left to itself, can by no means discern."

† Loc. cit. p. 330.

ceivable fancy of the brain, might be supported by Scripture.*

Swedenborg's total ignorance of ecclesiastical and dogmatic history, and his presumption, in despite of this ignorance, to allege their testimony in support of his opinion, are particularly afflicting. He ventures on the assertion, that from the time of the Apostles, down to the Council of Nice, his notion of the Trinity, was the prevailing belief of the Church, till of a sudden in this Council, the true belief was lost!! It is remarkable, withal, that elsewhere he includes among the heretics of the first ages the Sabellians; although, it is precisely among these that he might have found the most accurate resemblance to his own errors. In truth, had he known, that in the second and third centuries, the very few persons, who professed principles similar to his own, were menaced with exclusion from ecclesiastical communion, if they refused to renounce their opinions, utterly repugnant as they were to the universal doctrine of the Church:—had he been aware, that Praxeas was forced to exhibit a document, wherein he revoked his error; that Beryllus, at the Synod of Bostra, was prevailed upon by the Arabian bishops, as well as by Origen, whom they had summoned to their aid, to take the same step; and, that Sabellius excited such great agitation in the Egyptian Church, and became the object of such general abhorrence;—how could he have had the hardihood to put forth the assertion, that down to the Council of Nice, his opinion was the faith of the Church! If in modern days, many since the time of Souverän have asserted, that the ante-Nicene period was addicted to the Arian heresy; a superficial

* Loc. cit. p. 163.

study of authorities, at least, might have led to such a result; but Swedenborg's assertion, presupposes the utter absence of all historical inquiry. Yet a book, in which such gross and palpable errors are found, he dares to extol as a work of such Divine contents, that on its completion, the Apostles entered upon a mission through the whole spiritual world; that on its publication, the very salvation of futurity depends; and that with it commences the new eternal Church!

In respect to the reasoning of Swedenborg, it bears occasionally, in its main features, a striking resemblance to that of the earlier Arians, especially *Ætius* and *Eunomius*, except only that these two Arian leaders evince far more acuteness and dexterity. It is equally certain, that those Unitarians, in the earliest period of the Church, who bear most affinity to Swedenborg, knew how to allege, in behalf of their tenets, far more plausible and more ingenious Scriptural arguments, as we may perceive from the work of *Tertullian* against *Praxeas*, from the fragments of *Hippolytus* against *Nœtus*, and of the *Pseudo-Athanasius* against the followers of *Sabellius*. Whosoever, therefore, possesses but the slightest acquaintance with the writings of *Athanasius*, *Hilary*, *Basil*, *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Gregory of Nyssa*, and *Augustine*, (who, with such decided superiority, have defended the doctrine of the Church, against the earlier and the later Arians, as well as against the *Sabellians*), must consider with amazement the efforts of Swedenborg, who, with powers immeasurably inferior, attempted to undermine the belief in a dogma, which, in consequence of the defence that it had met with, on the part of these intellectual giants, had received even a stronger scientific demonstration.

§ LXXX.—Swedenborg denies the fall of man in Adam.—Contradictions in his theory on this matter.

We pass now from the most striking peculiarity in Swedenborg's theology* to his Anthropology, where, however, it will be only his doctrine on human sinfulness, and particularly original sin, that will engage our attention. The latter, as we remarked above, he denies; but, he falls into the most singular self-contradictions. The account in the Bible, respecting the fatal disobedience of our first parents, he explains as an allegory, and regards Adam and Eve, not as real personages, but only (to use his own words), as personifications of the primitive Church.† And he adds, that "if this be well understood, the opinion hitherto received and cherished, that the sin of Adam is the cause of that evil, which is innate in man from his parents, will fall to the ground."‡ Swedenborg doth not deny, however, that a propensity to sin is transmitted from parents to children; yet, he adds, that it is to be deduced from the parents only, as he says, "hereditary evil, my friend, is derived solely from a man's parents;" and elsewhere, he even asserts, with great exaggeration, "that man from his mother's womb is nothing but evil."§ If on one hand, the propagation of an evil by descent be admitted, and on the other, the universality of the evil itself be not called in question, how can we stop at the parents of a child? The question necessarily arises; how then did the

* The word *Theology*, is here used by the author in a primitive sense, as doctrines that treat of the nature and the attributes of God.—*Trans.*

† Vol. ii. p. 110. "By Adam and his wife is meant the most ancient Church, that existed on our earth."

‡ Loc. cit. p. 196.

§ Loc. cit. p. 195.

parents come by the evil? And if doubtless, it be answered, that they received the bad heritage from their parents, and these again from theirs, we shall certainly, at last, arrive at the first man, called in the Sacred Writings, Adam; and shall be obliged to confess, that the universal phenomenon hath a primary, and withal, universal cause, and, consequently, that sin in the human race, is only the developement of sin in Adam. How can we therefore say, that children inherit from their parents a principle of sin, without recurring to the first man? By the allegorical explanation of the Scriptural narrative of the Fall, nothing is gained. For, in the first place, admitting even such an explanation, still the sexual propagation of man must have certainly had a beginning; and, as even according to Swedenborg, the developement of sin keeps equal pace with the sexual propagation, we are thus compelled to recur to some beginning—to some first sinner, in whose fall the others were subsequently involved. In the second place, if, with Swedenborg, we even take Adam to be a mere collective name, yet it must, at all events, be admitted, that the later race of men have inherited from the earlier a principle of sin, since its sexual transmission our seer does not pretend to deny. To Adam, accordingly, we must even go back, whether by that name we understand an individual, or a generation of men. But, whether Holy Writ teach the former or the latter, no one, who reveres St. Paul's epistles as canonical, can for a moment doubt; for in Romans, c. v. 12-14, Adam is very clearly designated as he, by whose fall, the fall of all others has been determined; and he is expressly characterised as one person (*δι' ἑνός ἀνδρώπου*). From whatever side, therefore, we contemplate Swedenborg's doctrine, it appears full of obscurities and inconsistencies.

The cause of these contradictions lies, as we said above, in his misguided opposition to the Lutheran doctrine, which regards original sin as a total depravation of man, wherein all free-will is utterly destroyed. Swedenborg now endeavouring, on one hand, to save free-will, and to discover, in the personal abuse of freedom, the guiltiness of individuals; and, on the other hand, withheld, by a deeper feeling, from regarding the individual as merely isolated, and possessing evidently a glimpse of the truth, that no man liveth for himself, nor severed from mankind, but is vitally involved in the destinies of the organic whole,—Swedenborg, I say, fell into such-like inconsistencies, that, in one moment, set up a proposition, and, in the next, subvert it again. He perceives, if we may so speak, an universal flood of sin; but he dreads to examine it closely, and conceals from himself its source. We cannot, by this theory, understand how sin came into the world; nor can Reason be satisfied with a doctrine of an evil, being inherited by children from their parents, when that evil is considered as a mere accident, and is referred to no primary cause. Or does Swedenborg derive this evil propensity, transmitted by sexual propagation, from the original constitution of man? Then, undoubtedly, the undeniable fact would not be represented, as a mere accident; but, we find in Swedenborg's writings no syllable to justify such a supposition. On the other hand, Gustavus Knös, professor of the oriental languages at the University of Upsal, who died some years ago, and who was by no means a slavish follower of Swedenborg, has, in his soliloquies on God, man, and the world, set forth evil, as something *necessarily* connected with the finite nature of man. But, the question recurs, whether the other Swedenborgians will subscribe to so perverse

a doctrine. Without this tenet, their theory of hereditary evil is the most incoherent rhapsody, that can well be imagined.

§ LXXXI.—Incarnation of the Divinity.—Objects of the Incarnation.—
Relation between grace and free-will.

We must now describe the objects of the Incarnation of the Divinity, as set forth by Swedenborg. The rejection of the great dogma of the Atonement, through Christ's bloody sacrifice on the cross, so essentially Christian, so clearly founded in Scripture and Tradition, is intimately connected with the misapprehension of the origin of human sinfulness. The Scriptural opposition between the first and the second Adam, is devoid of sense, in the system of Swedenborg. Having once abandoned the Scriptural point of view, he was no longer able to discover, in the condition of mankind, any adequate cause to account for the incarnation of the Logos. He, accordingly, in order to assign sufficient motives for this great event, looked for the causes, beyond the sphere of humanity. The human mind is urged by an indomitable instinct, to consider itself an integral member of a great spiritual kingdom extending over all worlds, and to connect the prosperity of the divine institutions established on earth, as well as the disorders and concussions, which interrupt their normal developement of life, with occurrences in the next world, and to regard them as a continuance of the vibrations of the latter. Of this fact, the Myths of the Indians, and the religious doctrines of the Parsi, will furnish us with primitive proofs. Christianity, also, points to a connexion between the fall of the human race, and the precipitation of higher spirits into the

abyss; and speaks, with the utmost clearness, of their continued efforts, to maintain and extend the corruption, which, by their means, had been introduced upon our earth. On the other hand, it teaches the active interest, which the spirits, who remained faithful, as well as the souls, who here below died in communion with Christ, and are glorified in the other world, exert for the diffusion of God's kingdom, and its consolidation on earth. But, in Scripture and the Tradition of the Church, all this is set forth, in a very simple and general outline. But, in the hands of the fantastic Christian Gnostics, particularly the Valentinians, the simple doctrine of the Church was transformed into a vast and connected, but fanciful drama. They taught that the empire of Eons was disturbed by the passionate desire of Sophia—that the latter has been redeemed, and the former renovated; yet, that it was only through the re-establishment in Christ of all the Pneumatic natures, which, in consequence of the aforesaid perturbations, had been transferred into this temporal life, perfect harmony has been restored even in the world of spirits. In the Gnostic, as well as in the Manichean systems, the darker powers are brought into a more or less artificial, and often utterly inconceivable connexion with occurrences in the Kingdom of Light, which has to be secured against their strenuous efforts to invade its frontiers, and to conquer it. Now a similar course Swedenborg pursues. He says, “Redemption consisted in reducing the hells into subjection, and bringing the heavens into an orderly arrangement, and renewing the Church on earth by this means; and there is no possible method, by which the omnipotence of God could effect these purposes, than by assuming the humanity; just as there is no possibility for a man to work without

hands and arms; wherefore, the humanity is called in the word, 'the arm of Jehovah.' " *—Jos. xi. 10; xiii. 1.

Swedenborg gives the following more detailed description of the disorders, that, in consequence of the invasion of satanic powers, had broken out in the kingdom of happy spirits, and of the deliverance from this danger, by the mediation of the Redeemer. The Church terrestrial, says he, forms, together with the orders of Spirits in the next world, an organic whole, so that both may be compared to a man, whose entire members suffer, when one only is diseased. The members of God's community on earth, constitute, as it were, the feet of this great body and its thighs; the celestial spirits, are the breast, the shoulders, and so forth. The continued growth of moral corruption here below, has, accordingly, exerted the most disturbing influence on the whole spiritual world, and placed it in a condition similar to that of a man, obliged to sit on a throne with a broken footstool. The dominion of Satan has, moreover, been so prodigiously enlarged, by the very great immigrations from the earth, that his subjects dared to penetrate beyond the frontiers of the blessed, and even threatened to drag these down with them into the abyss. Now the incarnate God delivered the good spirits from this importunity of the demons, as He drove them back within the limits of hell; for, as beasts of prey retreat into their dens; as frogs dip under water, when their enemies approach; so fled the demons, when the Lord came out against them.† We see how Swedenborg here abused the Apostolic doctrine of Christ's descent into hell.

He further observes, that, by this judicial action, by

* Vol. i. p. 168.

† Vol. i. p. 237.

this rigid separation of the good from the wicked, the Lord hath exhibited himself as righteousness itself; but by no means in rendering perfect obedience, during his earthly life in the room of men, and, in this way, becoming their righteousness. His obedience in general (he continues), and his crucifixion—the last temptation of the Lord in his humanity, especially, have merited for the latter, only perfect glorification, that is to say, the perfect union with the Deity. No merit of Christ, therefore, according to Swedenborg, is imputable to man—no vicarious satisfaction can exist. In his opposition against Lutheran orthodoxy, which appeared to him to undermine all vital Christianity, he went so far, as even to deny that evangelical dogma, from which the Christian derives an inexhaustible moral strength—that dogma, which hath conquered the world. In the great disfigurement, which that doctrine had, doubtless, experienced in the confessions of the Lutherans, he could not discover the simple, great, and profound truth—he misapprehended, especially, its psychological importance, and even proceeded so far, as to uphold a redemption, in part, at least, depending on the application of mere mechanical powers.*

* Möhler says, that according to Swedenborg's theory, "Redemption, in part at least, depended on the application of mere mechanical powers." How so? Because the Swedish prophet makes Redemption to consist, chiefly, in the reducing the hells into subjection, in delivering the blessed spirits from the importunity of demons, and in producing, by this means, the renovation of the Church. The Catholic Church, on the other hand, teaches that the object of the Redemption, was the restoration of fallen man, his deliverance from sin, and especially original sin. This is the doctrine clearly inculcated in Holy Writ.—See Luke xix. 10; John iii. 14; Gal. iv. 4, 5; Heb. v. 1, seq.; John i. 29; Rom. v. 12, 15, 21; vi. vii.; 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22. Thus, according to Swedenborg, Redemption produced, as it were, a mere outward

But here Swedenborg could not rest ; and the mode, wherein he still describes the necessity of the Incarnation of the Deity, for the regeneration of mankind, is certainly entitled to the epithet of ingenious. His view is not new, and was already unfolded by the Fathers of the Church, and the Schoolmen, and with greater clearness, copiousness, and precision, than by Swedenborg ; but, as we have, however, no ground for supposing, that he was acquainted with the labours of anterior times on this matter, we ought not to refuse him the merit of an original discovery. He says, without the condescension of God in Christ, faith were comparable to a look cast up towards the heavens, and would be utterly lost in the vague and the immeasurable ; but through Christ it hath received its proper object, and is, thereby, become more definite. Some fathers of the Church express this thought in the following manner ; to wit, that by his own powers, man is unable to rise above a mere void, meaningless, unconscious yearning, and that it is only through revelation this yearning is satisfied, and is blessed with a true object. Swedenborg adds (in common with Cardinal Cusa, who has treated this subject in a most intellectual manner), that, in the relations of man to God, the human and the divine, the earthly and the heavenly must every where pervade each other ; that, by communion with the incarnate Deity, faith and love receive their higher and eternal sanction ; but, that as God hath lived among us in a human shape, those virtues have, thereby, obtained their right foundation, and then only became our own ;

mechanical change in the moral condition of mankind ; but, according to Catholic doctrine, it brought about a living, internal, and organic change.—*Trans.*

for, the Divine in itself would remain inaccessible to us.* The one great work of Divine Mercy, we may contemplate from many points of view ; and the more comprehensive is our contemplation of that work, the deeper will be our reverence and adoration. But, that so important principle in the Incarnation, which is so clearly expressed in Holy Writ, so distinctly asserted through all centuries of the Church, and plastically stamped, if I may so speak, on her public worship—the principle, that the death of the Lord is our life—ought never to be thrown into the back-ground, much less absolutely rejected.

What the northern prophet says as to the duties, required on the part of man, in order that he should realize, within himself, the regeneration, designed for him by God, has much resemblance with the doctrine of the Catholic Church. In Christ, says Swedenborg, Divine truth and love became manifest. Hence, man must approach unto him, and receive the truth in faith, and walk according to the same in love ; faith without love, or love without faith, has no value. Hence, respecting Justification, he has nearly the same idea, which the Catholic Church has ever inculcated ; and in his opinion, it is essentially identical with the sanctification, and inward renovation, produced in faith in Christ.† But here the great distinction is to be observed, that he deduces not the forgiveness of sins from the merits of Christ. The relation between Grace and Free-will, is

* Vol. i. p. 552.

† Vol. i. p. 283. “By means of divine truth originating in good, that is, by means of faith originating in charity, man is reformed and regenerated, and also renewed, quickened, sanctified, justified ; and, in proportion to this progress and growth in these graces, is purified from evils ; in which purification consists the remission of sins.”

pretty well set forth; and in such a way, that he deviates not into Pelagianism, and scarcely into Semipelagianism—a circumstance, which from Swedenborg's opposition to Luther's doctrine, must really excite surprise.

But the historian of dogmas will be filled with astonishment, when, on these matters, he turns his attention to Swedenborg's historical observations. In order to justify the connexion, which he has assumed between the doctrine of the Trinity, and that of the vicarious Satisfaction, he asserts, that with the Council of Nice, the Protestant doctrine of the imputation of Christ's merits has been introduced and maintained.* This assertion involves a two-fold error; in the first place, because, before the aforesaid council, an imputation of Christ's merits can be proved to have been the universal belief of the Church; and secondly, because, from that council down to the sixteenth century, the peculiar Lutheran theory on this subject, with the exception of some slight and scattered traces, is not to be found. Luther himself never vaunted of this concurrence with the doctrine of the Church, subsequently to the Council of Nice. On the contrary, he made it his glory to have caught a deeper insight into the meaning of St. Paul, than all the fathers of the Church. Swedenborg need only have read the commentaries on St. Paul's Epistles, which Chrysostom and Theodoret, in the Greek Church,

* Vol. iii. p. 317. "That the faith, which is imputative of the merit and righteousness of Christ the Redeemer, first took its rise from the decrees in the Council of Nice, concerning three Divine Persons from eternity; which faith, from that time to the present, has been received by the whole Christian world." P. 312: "That imputation and the faith of the present Church, which alone is said to justify, are one thing."

and Ambrosiaster and Jerome, in the Latin, have composed, to see the fallacy of his strange conceit. As to the theologians of the middle age, every page of their writings will refute the assertion of Swedenborg. How then would the opposition between Catholics and Protestants be explicable, if, on the article of belief in question, the former had ever put forth the same doctrine as the latter? Swedenborg does not even adduce a single historical testimony, in support of his assertion, and contents himself with mere round assurances, without reflecting that, in matters so important, proofs, and not mere assurances, are required. Swedenborg was not aware, that we can believe in an imputation of the merits of Christ, without being in the least forced to adopt the peculiar theories of the Reformers of Wittenberg and of Geneva. In other places, where he treats of the separation of Protestants from the Catholic Church, and of their peculiar doctrines, in consequence of that schism, he even contradicts himself, forgets, at all events, the broad distinction, which, according to what has been already recounted, he had laid down between Catholics and Protestants, as to their capability for embracing, in the next world, the entire truth, and precisely in regard to the article of Justification.

Upon his doctrine of Free-will, also, Swedenborg did not a little pique himself, under the supposition, that it was utterly unknown to the whole Christian Church; and his English editor, in all seriousness, points to this notion, as to something quite new and unheard-of. Truly, if we attend only to the Formulary of concord, from which Swedenborg makes long extracts, as well as to the writings of Calvin, we should be justified in believing, that the doctrine of Free-will, is nowhere any longer known. But how much soever Swedenborg

descants on Free-will, he gives, amid all his images, no very clear notion of it, although it is not to be doubted that this idea floated before his mind.*

§ LXXXII.—Swedenborg's Doctrine relative to the Sacraments.

Swedenborg's doctrine on the Sacraments, has, independently of its peculiar language, nothing very striking, although he thinks the contrary, and opines, that without knowledge of the spiritual sense, that is to say, the mystico-allegorical meaning, and especially of the correspondences between heaven and earth, nothing solid can be adduced even on this article of belief. Moreover the two sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper (for more he doth not acknowledge), are, in his opinion, very precious; and he strives, with all his powers, to promote a lively reverence for, and worthy reception of the same. Of baptism, he teaches, that, through three stages, it is designed to work an inward purification. In the first place, it conducts into the Christian Church; secondly, by its means, the Christian is brought to a knowledge and recognition of the Saviour and Redeemer; and thirdly, in it man is born again through the Lord. But, these three objects of baptism, are, in themselves, one and the same, and are in the same relation one to the other, as cause and effect, and the medium between the two.*

But the knowledge of celestial correspondences, above all, serves to initiate Christians into the essence of the holy communion. Flesh and bread are the earthly

* Vol. i. pp. 108-156.

† Vol. ii. p. 273.

‡ Loc. cit. p. 389. "In a like manner as a first cause, a middle cause, which is the efficient, and ultimate cause, which is the effect, and the end, for the sake of which the former causes were produced."

signs of the Divine love and goodness (holiness); blood and wine the emblem of God's truth and wisdom. Eating is like to appropriation. But now, flesh and bread in the holy communion, are the Lord himself, considered in the character of love and goodness. Blood and wine, in like manner, the Lord himself in His truth and wisdom. There accordingly are, as Swedenborg expresses himself, three principles, which, in this sacrament especially, are interwoven into each other:—the Lord, his Divine goodness, and his Divine truth; and consequently, it is evident, that in the Lord's Supper, all the blessings of heaven and the Church are, in an especial manner, included and imparted; for, in these three principles, which constitute the universal, all particulars are contained. Thus God, and with Him faith and charity, are the gifts, vouchsafed to man in the participation of this sacrament. That the glorified humanity is here present, together with the Divinity, Swedenborg, in a special section, very clearly shows, and observes, at the same time, that the Eucharist is a spiritual food, for the very reason that the glorified humanity is there proffered to us.

In order to prove the possibility of such a participation, Swedenborg observes: every sound soul has the faculty to receive from the Lord wisdom, that is to say, truths, and to augment the same to all eternity; in like manner to receive charity, and to increase perpetually in the same. But now, the Lord is charity and wisdom itself; consequently man is able to unite himself to him. It is here evident, that wisdom and charity are regarded by Swedenborg as something substantial—as the subtlest emanations from the Deity, and the Deity itself: in the same way, as in the other world, he beheld God as a sun, from which alone light and heat are

emitted, that is to say, wisdom and charity. To avoid probably pantheistic views, the prophet adds, the Divinity itself cannot be *identified*, but only *united* with man; in the same manner as the sun is not conjoined with the eye, nor the air with the ear, but are only adjoined to those organs, in order to render the senses of seeing and of hearing possible.*

In the same way, continues Swedenborg, as baptism introduces us into the Church, the holy communion introduces us into heaven. For, the Lord and Saviour, who is present in the sacrament, has necessarily heaven also in his train, and opens it to those, who worthily partake of the divine repast. It is otherwise with the unworthy communicant. To the worthy, God is, in this feast, inwardly and outwardly present:—inwardly, by His love and truth; outwardly, by His omnipresence, which determines the existence of all things. In the wicked is found the mere general omnipresence of God, without the former. To mere carnal and mere natural men, who withdraw from obedience to God, and only know and speak of the Divine Truth, but never practise it, the Lord, in despite of existence, reveals not heaven. One might feel disposed to conclude from this, that Swedenborg agrees with Calvin, when he teaches, that to the reprobate, the glorified body of the Lord is not imparted. Swedenborg, however, is utterly opposed to the Genevan Reformer, for, according to the latter, the food of eternal life is not imparted to him, who is predestined to eternal death; but, according to the former,

* Loc. cit. p. 445. “Still, however, as man is a finite being, the Lord, divinity itself, cannot be *conjoined* with him, but *adjoined*.” At p. 70, the author says, that “*conjoined*,” signifies an unity like that of the fruit with the tree, but “*adjoined*,” a more external union, as when fruits are bound to a tree.

it is only not received by the unworthy communicant, that is to say, not imbibed in the inmost life of the spirit, although proffered to him.* What Swedenborg teaches, besides, respecting the Eucharist ; to wit, that it worketh an union with the Deity, and is the stamp of the sons of God, and so forth, is only a further consequence of what has been hitherto stated. Moreover, in his exposition of the doctrine of the Eucharist, Swedenborg entirely passes over the relation, which the same bears to the death of our Lord, and to the forgiveness of sins, clearly as that relation is pointed out in Holy Writ. The motives, for this his omission, are to be sought for, in the above-mentioned view, which he takes of Christ's passion and death.

§ LXXXIII.—Swedenborg's revelations from the other world.

With the information, which Swedenborg brought from the next world, respecting its state and its relations, and which he has recorded in his writings, we wish not to amuse our readers ; though to many, undoubtedly, the investigation of this subject would be, precisely, the most attractive. We shall only communicate so much as appears necessary, partly to complete our knowledge of the Swedenborgian doctrines, and partly to explain much, that has been hitherto stated. When souls quit the visible world, they go to a locality hovering between heaven and hell ; and feeling themselves by degrees irresistibly attracted to their kindred spirits, they gradually advance into heaven or hell.

The husband, with haste, seeks his spouse, and *vice versâ* ; and in general, each one the companions of his

* Loc. cit. p. 396.

earthly sufferings and joys, among whom alone he finds himself at home. In these descriptions, Swedenborg indisputably displays a very subtle psychology. Those, moreover, who are neither ripe for heaven, nor find joy in hell, are instructed and educated, until, by the use of their freedom, they attain unto pure truth and charity, whereby heaven becomes accessible to them. The members of every religion, confession, and sect, receive teachers of their own party, and the Heathen, Jew, and Mohammedan, are not excluded from this school. But, if they resist all attempts for their improvement or perfection, they are then swallowed up by hell. We do not see why Swedenborg should have manifested such a decided hostility against the Catholic doctrine of purgatory, although, undoubtedly, between the latter and the intermediate place of the Swedenborgians, important differences are to be found.

The relations in the next world, according to the depositions of our eye-witness, perfectly resemble those on earth. There also, are houses, and palaces, with rooms and furniture; there, too, mountains and valleys, rivers and lakes. Time, also, and a very substantial space, rule the world of spirits. Nations and individuals retain their peculiarities; hence, in the next world, the Dutch still carry on commerce. The only difference is, that all things are in a more glorified and spiritual shape, than here below, for, the gross body of the present life is thrown off; and even the resurrection of the flesh, according to Swedenborg, does not take place. The new body, however, retains quite the form of the old one, so that many, who pass into the next life, perceive not that they no longer possess their former corporeal integument.

In 1757, the last judgment was held, and Sweden-

borg, as an amazed spectator, assisted at it. The same is also held from time to time. Even the damned could be delivered, if they wished. Swedenborg saw one of them, who had once been a highway-robber, and had been guilty of adultery, and who, somehow or other, had strayed among the angels. These endeavoured to work on his understanding, and he really understood what they said and wished. But, on their demanding him to love the truth, which he recognized ; he replied, he would not, and returned to hell. The phenomenon Swedenborg makes use of, in order to prove Free-will. Here, the penetrative man evinces his sagacity ; for, certainly, there are reprobates, who will not be happy, and therefore cannot be so. This narrative agrees very well with the other doctrines of Swedenborg, that God is perpetually present with man, so long as he lives, and exerts a constant influence over him to procure his conversion ; but, that those who die in the wickedness of their heart, are irreformable, “because the interiors of their minds, says Swedenborg, are fixed and determined.”

§ LXXXIV.—Biblical Canon of Swedenborg. Allegorico-mystical Exegesis.

With Swedenborg's peculiar views on Holy Writ, we must now make our readers acquainted.* On perusing his writings, we are soon very painfully surprised with the fact, that he makes no doctrinal use of St. Paul's epistles. At least, we cannot recall to our recollection, that we have ever found any notice taken of them, even on those points, where such would be indispensable ; as

* Vol. i. pp. 373-460.

in the articles of Justification, and of Faith, and of its relation to Works. This fact we, at last, found cleared up, "by the chief articles of faith of the New Church," subscription to which is required, as a condition, from all those who desire to enter into the community, founded by Swedenborg. In these "chief articles," we find the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament enumerated; but, among the component parts of the latter, the four Gospels and the Apocalypse are alone reckoned.* The influence, which Swedenborg's dogmatic system exerted, on the framing of his Biblical Canon, no one can deny. Hence, before we could speak of the latter, it was necessary to set forth his doctrines. The rejection of the dogmas of original sin, of the vicarious satisfaction of Christ, of the resurrection of the flesh, and so forth, led him to expunge, from the catalogue of the sacred writings, the Epistles of St. Paul, the Acts of the Apostles, in short, every thing which, even by the most forced interpretation, could not be made to harmonize with his own errors. In the Acts of the Apostles, especially, the account of the real descent of the Paraclete, who was to lead the Church into all truth, and to abide with her for ever, must, undoubtedly, have been a great stumbling-block in his way. In fact, the Swedenborgians endeavour to represent their master as him, who has at last communicated what originally was inaccessible, or unintelligible, to believers. I have discovered, at least, that Swedenborg's disciples, in proof of the divine mission of their teacher, have appealed to those promises of a Paraclete, recorded in St. John's Gospel. When, moreover, the apostle saith: "No eye

* "Divine Revelations made known by Swedenborg, translated into German by Emanuel Tafels." Vol. ii. Tübingen, 1824.

hath seen, no ear hath heard, nor hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive, what God hath prepared for those who love Him ;” he must certainly have appeared not very entitled to credence, in the estimation of one, who, in his own person had observed the joys of the blessed, and in his writings had lifted up, for the edification of mankind, the veil, which the apostle had fain have thrown over the realms of eternity. When Swedenborg rejected, also, the Epistle of St. James, and other scriptures, as uncanonical, he was driven, for consistency’s sake, to this step.

If, together with this arbitrary mode of dealing with the canon, we consider the following hermeneutical principles of Swedenborg, we shall not be surprised, that the most fantastic doctrines should have been propounded by him as Christian. Swedenborg says, that, in the literal sense of Holy Writ, the Divine truth is contained in all its plenitude, holiness, and power ; and to the demonstration of this truth, he devotes a special treatise. Yet, he supposes a mystical sense, which he calls the spiritual one, to be concealed in the letter of Scripture ; so that the entire truth is comprised in its every word, nay, often in its every syllable ! This doctrine Swedenborg establishes in the closest connexion with those correspondences, that, according to him, exist between heaven and earth, and he gives several interpretations of texts from the Apocalypse, whereby he endeavours to render his view more evident. These theories, considered in themselves, are not so very obnoxious to censure ; they, on the contrary, are based on a great truth, and, to a certain extent, are justified by those relations, which, according to the most explicit declarations in the New Testament, exist between the Scriptures of the Old and the New Covenant. To this

mode of interpretation, as an exercise for mystical acuteness (if we dare use such an expression), we even cannot entirely deny all value. It is, likewise, a well-known fact, that, according to the character of different ages, and the peculiarities of individual men, it has had great influence in awakening religious feelings, and, at many periods, has guarded Holy Writ against the contempt of arrogant, carnal-minded men, or against the neglect of men, pious indeed, but utterly unacquainted with the laws of a grammatical and historical, yet spiritual, exegesis. But, if such a mode of interpretation, when not practised by inspired writers, opens, under all circumstances, boundless scope to the play of an irregular fancy, or to the effusions of mere individual feeling, it is sure to lead to the grossest errors, when it is made the medium for discovering, and establishing, articles of doctrine. Dogmas, which by the most unhistorical method, men had perhaps stumbled on, may, by self-delusion and a small portion of wit, be found stated in every text of Scripture. This was now actually the case with Swedenborg, who could discover the strangest things in the Bible. Lastly, the presumptuous ignorance, with which he judges the history of the allegorico-mystical interpretation of Scripture, appears highly censurable. The higher the estimation is, in which he holds the latter, the greater the earnestness wherewith he asserts, that it was all but unknown, as well among the Jews, on account of their carnal sense, as among the Christians of the first three centuries, on account of their too great simplicity, and among those of subsequent ages, from the general corruption. He insists, that it was only by a special revelation he was made attentive to it, or at all events favoured with the true key for its right use. But what is his distinc-

tion between the various senses of Holy Writ, other than the *Sod* (body), the *Derusch* (soul), and the *Pha-schüth* (spirit), of the *Cabala*;—senses which themselves correspond to the *σῶμα*, the *ψυχή*, and the *πνεῦμα*, of Philo? * And wherein do the Swedenborgian correspondences between heaven and earth, so essentially differ from the celestial and terrestrial Jerusalem (the *ἄνω* and the *κατω* *Ἱερουσαλήμ*), the carnal and the spiritual Israel (the *Ἰσραὴλ σαρκικός* and *πνευματικός*), with which the same Philo has made us acquainted? And what shall we say to the astounding assertion, that in the first centuries of the Church, the allegorico-mystical exegesis was unknown! Just as if Basilides, Valentinus, and Origen, had lived in the sixth century! That Swedenborg should have possessed any acquaintance with the writings of Gregory the Great, of Alcuin, of Richard, of St. Victor, or with the description of the three senses given by Thomas Aquinas and others, it would be too much to require of him; nor should we have even noticed the contradictions, into which he has fallen with well-known historical facts, had he not vaunted himself as an extraordinary divine envoy, and represented his book as one written under God's especial guidance.

Swedenborg shows great pettiness, and even childishness, in making a sort of fire-work out of Holy Writ. In the spiritual world, says he, where the Bible is preserved in holy chests, in the sanctuary of the Temple, it is regarded with respect by the angels; and it is as radiant as a great star, and, at times, like the

* Vol. i. p. 378. "The spiritual sense doth not appear in the literal sense, being within it, as the soul is in the body; or as the thought of the understanding is in the eye, or as the affection of love is in the countenance."

sun, and its glimmering splendour forms the most magnificent rainbow ! If any one, with his hands or clothes, touch the Bible, he is immediately environed with a brilliant fire, and he appears as if standing in the midst of a star, bathed in light ! This, adds Swedenborg, he has often seen and admired ! But if any one, entangled in errors, look into the sacred coffer, then his eyes are overclouded with deep darkness ; and if he venture to touch the Word itself, an explosion immediately ensues, which flings him “into a corner of the room.”* Had these descriptions been mere allegorical representations, to point out to sensual men the effulgence of divine light, wherewith a soul is filled, that with feelings hallowed to God draws from Holy Writ life and nurture ; and, on the other hand, the profound darkness and appalling night that encompass those, who pervert Scripture to the confirmation of the fancies of their own brain ; we should then have commended the aptness of such illustrations. But such is not Swedenborg’s meaning ; he here designs to state positive facts. For our part, we here discern an idolatry manifested to the dead word of Scripture, which exceeds all that the slavishness to the mere letter has ever exhibited, and has perhaps no parallel in history, except in the controversy among Mohammedans, whether the Koran be created or uncreated. Yet even the rational Moslem will reply, that the ideas, indeed, of the sacred book are eternal, but by no means the form, wherein they are set forth.

* Loc. cit. p. 396.

§ LXXXV.—Swedenborg's place in History.

To form a more comprehensive knowledge of Swedenborgianism, it is necessary to point out more fully the idea, which its author entertained of his own historical importance. He divides the history of the world into so many great periods, which he denominates Churches; to wit, the Antediluvian; the Asiatico-African, which attained its term by the introduction of idolatry; the Mosaic; and, lastly, the Christian Church. In the latter, he again distinguishes four Churches, the Ante-Nicene, the Greek, the Roman Catholic, and the Protestant. The last-named, also, like the preceding Churches, has already reached its end: hence, with the New Community, the times revert to the origin of the Church—to primitive Christianity, whose principles can henceforth never more be forsaken. So far Swedenborg, who, as is clear from this, formed no slight estimate of his own historical importance. Let us first take into consideration the view of universal history, prior to Christ, as set forth by him. He says, the four great periods of the world follow each other, according to the type of the four seasons of the year, and the four times of the day; and the same regularity, which, on a small scale, is observed in this succession of times, exists there on a larger scale. On the impropriety of making Christianity fall in with the winter and the night, we will not lay any particular stress, although Christianity expressly declares itself to be the never-setting noon-day of ages. But, what Christian can tolerate the subordinate position which is assigned to Christ! Instead of representing him, as the great centre-point of the world's history, he is made to begin a period merely

coordinate with the other epochs of the world ! This would have been, at least, no error of the understanding, had Swedenborg regarded Christ as a mere man ; but, it becomes the greatest of errors, since Christ he considers to be the incarnate God. If the Deity manifests Himself in the flesh, so thereby, it is hoped, an epoch is introduced, to which nothing can be adjoined, but all things should be made subordinate. From this point of view alone, Swedenborg might have discerned the essential defects in his system.

The cause of this perverse construction of human history, must be looked for in the fact, that Swedenborg would not acknowledge a general fall of the human race, and, in reality, was at a loss how to explain the very evident fact of a radical sinfulness in man. Had Swedenborg deeply considered the scriptural opposition between the first and the second Adam, instead of occupying himself with allegories in respect to the first ; had he, in the fall of Adam, deplored with a pious simplicity, at least, the fall of all mankind, though he had been incapable of comprehending the speculative reasons of this fact, then the whole period, from Adam to Christ, would have appeared to him as the period of the developement of the sinful principle, and of an apostacy from God ; but, on the other hand, he would have regarded Christ as the great turning-point in history, with whom commenced the unfolding of the principle of sanctification, and of a return to the Deity. This one great period he might then have again, in some manner, subdivided ; but should never have placed the period from Adam to Noah, that from Noah to Moses (or what he calls the Asiatico-African Church), and the period from Moses to Christ, on the same level with the Christian epoch. Such a parallel was only

possible through a total misapprehension of the Christian view of the moral world. The texts in Romans (c. v. 14-21 ; xi. 32), and in Galatians (c. iii. 22), might alone have sufficed to teach him the right and the true view, had he not, on that very account, struck out St. Paul's Epistles from the catalogue of canonical Scriptures, precisely because they offer so clear a contradiction to his whole conception of religious History.

His main point of view being thus distorted, Swedenborg can give no satisfactory explanation of any great phenomenon in religious history ; on the contrary, in his system all is dismembered, unintelligible, and incoherent. The idolatry of Nature he deduces from the accidental circumstance, that the correspondences between the material and the spiritual world had been forgotten. The revelation, which, as Swedenborg positively asserts, was made to Enoch, and transmitted to the following generations (namely, that all objects in the lower world had their correlatives in the higher), and the true knowledge of these mutual relations in special, defined cases, were, in the course of ages, according to our prophet, effaced from the memory of nations ; earthly things were regarded without connexion with the things corresponding to them above ; and the veneration, which was due to the latter, was paid to the former. This view of Swedenborg's has much resemblance with the more common, but equally superficial, notion, that out of the confusion of the symbol with the object represented by it, idolatry arose. But, the question must ever recur, how could those relations adverted to be forgotten, and where must we look for the cause of this oblivion ? Wherefore, also, must the faith in the one, true God have been at the same time abandoned ? The consciousness of God was certainly not essentially

connected with the knowledge of such correspondences between heavenly and earthly things, since Enoch was the first to be instructed in them ; and yet before him, certainly, men had also known the true God. Had Swedenborg acknowledged a general darkening of the human mind through sin, a corruption transmitted from Adam, and with ever-increasing intensity, contaminating all generations, he would not have sought to account for the idolatry of Nature, from such mere external causes. He would have understood, that the soul severed from God by sin, necessarily fell under the dominion of Nature, and chose those Powers for the object of its worship, with whom it felt an especial affinity, and by whom it was invincibly attracted. The loss of the essential, internal, and universal correspondences between God and man, led to the ignorance of those external and particular correspondences, between the inferior and the higher order of the world. The separation of the soul from God, and its concentration within itself, first produced this conception of nature, as disconnected from all higher relations.

Let us, once more, call to mind one of the proofs attempted by Swedenborg, in support of the necessity of the Incarnation of the Deity, in order to bring back men to Himself ; for it is only here that proof can be perfectly appreciated. He says, the faith of man, considered in itself, may be compared to a look cast up vaguely towards the sky, but, through the Incarnation, is the same circumscribed, and directed to a definite object. If, hereby, the necessity of an Incarnation of the Divinity be rendered perfectly conceivable, yet this argument offers no reason, wherefore the Divine Word should have become flesh precisely at the commencement of the fourth period of the world. Swedenborg

might, just as well, have introduced this Theophany immediately after the creation of the first man. *Nay, he was forced to do this*, unless all the aberrations of the ages prior to Christianity—unless all Heathenism itself be regarded as perfectly guiltless. Did the first men, unfavoured as they were with the descent of the Son of God, cast a less vague look up to Heaven, than those of later times? For this very reason, Swedenborg should have placed the advent of Christ at the very origin of History; and thus the first, and not the fourth, period of the world, should have begun with Him. Had he, on the other hand, kept strictly in view the teaching of the Bible, as to the end of the mission of the Son of God, then he would have understood the epoch of his coming. The whole drama of History, as set forth by our prophet, appears without a plan; the members of the great historical organism appear to hang, as if by accident, together, and to mingle in blind confusion. Now we can see, wherefore Swedenborg himself seemed to have a sense of the unsatisfactoriness of the cause assigned by him, for the incarnation of the Deity at the particular period wherein it occurred; and wherefore he sought to aid his meagre representation, by a fantastic device as to the relation between heaven and hell. He saw himself forced to the adoption of this device, in order to account, by the relations of the next life, for the incarnation of the Deity, which had no foundation in this world's history;—a device, whereby the error of his whole historical construction, is not in the least degree obviated.

When we now come to the Christian period, what a singular view of its history, what an astonishing spectacle, presents itself here! The Church also, as we have already observed, is divided into a cycle of four

parts ; and yet, says Swedenborg, with the Council of Nice begins the great apostacy from Christian truth, which lasts down to his own time ! But the notion of apostacy, implies the idea of perversity and disorder. How then would it be possible to find a regular developement in the four Christian Churches, the three last members whereof are to be, in the same relation to the first, as summer, autumn, and winter, to the spring ; or even as youth, manhood, and old age, to infancy ! Where a well-ordered developement is observed, where a regular transition, from one state to another, is manifest, a rejection of the original vital principle is not conceivable. Where, on the other hand, this is rejected, as Swedenborg accuses the whole Church subsequent to the Council of Nice, of casting off such a principle, there a regular developement is not possible. Even our finisher of the Church had a sense of the incoherence of his historical constructions. On this account he endeavours to excuse, in some manner, the apostacy, and speaks of the beneficial variety of religious differences, that mutually enlighten one another, and even lets the remark escape him, that he had been informed, that those Churches, which are in different goods and truths, if only their goods have relation to the love of the Lord, and their truths to faith in him, are like so many precious jewels in a king's crown."*

If, hereby, a kind of necessity in the marked out succession of Churches is acknowledged, so no one, who holds the maxim, that, above all things, a writer should never contradict himself, would expect Swedenborg to designate all the Christian ages, that have elapsed since the Council of Nice, "as the very night ;" "as the

* Loc. cit. p. 515.

abomination of desolation ;” “ as that Church, wherein nothing spiritual is left remaining ;” * “ which in name only is Christian ;” † or (as the Anglican writer of the preface to the book, from which we have made our extracts, expresses himself), “ as the revelation of the mystery of iniquity ;” “ as the man of sin ;” or whatever other predicates may please him. A marvellous expansion, truly, of childhood to youth, to manhood, and to age !

After such a confused succession of times and of Churches, Swedenborg fitly follows as the extremest link. In a true developement, the continuation and the end are so connected with the beginning, that not only doth the latter follow the preceding in gentle transitions, but it grows out of it, and is in the same relation to it, as the bud, the blossom, and the fruit, are to the seed. Yet Swedenborgianism doth not grow out of the sequence of historical phenomena, but breaks suddenly in upon them. We have already had occasion to observe, that, according to Swedenborg, the corruption of the Church began at once, at a single stroke, as if by some magical interruption, to the train of thought of all her members. Equally abrupt and unexpected is the rise of his own religious system. He charges the Church existing before him, with having, by the abuse of free-will, abandoned, and never again returned, to the fundamental principles of Christianity ; and asserts, at the same time, that it is impossible to attain to them

* Loc. cit. p. 512. “ That the last time of the Christian Church is the very night, in which the former Churches have sat, is plain from the Lord’s prediction,” &c. Vol. i. p. 253 : “ Nothing spiritual is left remaining in it ” (the whole Church).

† Vol. ii. p. 373 : “ The former Church being Christian in name only, but not in essence and reality.”

again, without an intercourse with the spiritual world, —without the knowledge of certain truths, which no man, before him, possessed, because none had been favoured with the like revelations. But, as the revelations were the result of an extraordinary grace of God, and as, in the Church itself, all elements for a true regeneration had been, since the Nicene Council, utterly lost, how could the Swedenborgian Church follow the preceding Churches, in a regular order of developement? All sects, that had seceded from the Catholic Church, could, in a certain degree, give a plausible justification to their charges against her, inasmuch, as they appealed to Scripture, whereby her regeneration were possible. The censure of the Reformers, indeed, must always be termed incomprehensible, since it presupposed the free-will of those, against whom it was directed; and this faculty the Reformers denied to men, representing the Deity as the exclusive agent in all spiritual concerns, on whom it entirely depended to set aside, as by a magical stroke, all errors, and who, in consequence, was alone obnoxious to any charge, if in His household any thing were amiss. These reproaches, nevertheless, might, to men, who are not wont to reason with consistency, appear well-founded. But Swedenborg boasts that the true spiritual sense of Holy Writ was revealed to him in Heaven only, and, in consequence, quite independently of the ordinary channels, furnished through the original institution of the Church; and he therefore denies to the three preceding periods of Christianity, the utter possibility of possessing, through the then existing media, any sound doctrine whatsoever. And yet he describes the community he founded, as the crown of the Churches following each other “according to order!” Was then the apostacy of the

Nicene Council something conformable to order? Was the darkness of the Greek, the Roman Catholic, and the Protestant Churches, founded in the very ordinance of God? In the same way, too, as, according to the theory of our sage, Christ might have appeared in the time of Adam, Noah, and Moses; so he himself, from the destination assigned to him, might have commenced his career in the fourth, fifth, or sixth century of our era. And yet, the succession of the Churches was defined and systematic! Not the slightest reference to final causes can be discovered, in this contradictory view of History, and its result appears totally unworthy of the Deity.

But here, we must draw the attention of the reader to a special circumstance. Wherefore had Christ not power enough to stem, by his manifestation, the progress of sin, and to ensure the truth, he had brought to mankind, against the possibility of extinction? Wherefore did the Word, which was uttered from his lips, which was preserved and explained by his spirit, lose, so shortly after his ascension, its world-subduing energy? And wherefore doth it work with might and with victory, and become for ever permanent, only when proclaimed by Swedenborg? We should yet be disposed to think, that when God himself speaks, the Word is at least as lasting, as when a mortal babbles, though to him all mysteries in heaven should have been disclosed! The work of Christ lasted about three hundred years—a short spring-tide—till, at last, Swedenborg converts all into eternal spring! Is not this the most evident blasphemy? Swedenborg is really exalted to be the centre-point of all History, and to hold the place of the true Redeemer; with him, and not with Christ, the golden age returns!

§ LXXXVI.—Concluding Remarks.

The translations of Swedenborg's writings find, as we hear, a very great sale in and out of Germany, and the number of his followers daily increases. This we can perfectly understand. The unadorned Gospel, the simplicity of the Church's doctrine, are no longer capable of exciting an age so spiritually enervated, like our own. Truth must be set forth in glaring colours, and represented in gigantic proportions, if we hope to stimulate and stir the souls of this generation. The infinite void and obtuseness of religious feeling in our time, when it cannot grasp spirits by the hand, and see them pass daily before it, is incapable of believing in a higher spiritual world; and the fancy must be startled, by the most terrific images, if the hope of prolonging existence, in a future world, is not entirely to be extinguished. Long enough was the absurd, as well as deplorable endeavour made to banish miracles from the Gospel History; to undermine, with insolent mockery, the belief in the great manifestation of the Son of God; to call in question all living intercourse, between the Creator and the creature; and to inundate nations with the most shallow systems of morality; for these followed in the wake of such anti-Christian efforts. But, the yearning soul of man is not to be satisfied with such idle talk; and when you take from it true miracles, it will then invent false ones. Our age is doomed to witness the desolate spectacle of a most joyless languor, and impotence of the spiritual life, by the side of the most exaggerated and sickly excitement of the same; and if we do not, with a living and spiritual feeling, return to the doctrine of the Church, we shall soon see

the most wretched fanaticism obtain the same ascendancy, as we saw the most frivolous unbelief established on the throne. But by such phenomena will no one be conducted to the faith acceptable unto God; and the answer, which in the Gospel (Luc. xvi. 19) that luxurious, hard-hearted, rich man received from Abraham, when he begged him to send Lazarus to his brethren, to the end that they might be converted, may perfectly apply to Swedenborg's followers, when they hold that the world needs a visionary, in order to bring it back to the truth,* and will be found to contain a valid testimony against their prophet. We have Moses and the Prophets, and now also we have Christ and the Apostles, and the Church; and when we hear not these, we shall give no ear to him, who pretends to bring us tidings from the other world. With these words alone, hath Christ annihilated all expectations, which might attach to Swedenborg's visions.

* See the letter from Thomas Hartley, rector of Wenwick, in Northamptonshire, in the preface to the *True Christian Religion*, p. vii.

CHAPTER V.

THE SOCINIANS.

§ LXXXVII.—Relation of the Socinians to the Reformers.—Historical Remarks.

IN the Catholic system of doctrine, two elements—the Divine and the human, the natural and the supernatural, the mystical and the rational, or however else we may please to denominate them—move in uniform and harmonious combination; so that the rights of either appear adjusted in a manner, that must certainly extort esteem and admiration, from every reflecting mind. And whoever unites a pious, Christian, and ecclesiastical spirit to a cultivated intellect, must feel himself impelled to acknowledge, that God's protection hath guarded His Church in an eminent degree. But of the contrarieties, which in the Church are so beautifully harmonized, the one or the other can easily, in the individual believer, obtain the preponderance. Yet this preponderance will remain innocuous, if the one-sided principle will not proceed to a total misapprehension of its opposite, unduly appreciated as it is; and if the bonds of love, which unite the individual to the body of the Church, be maintained inviolate; for it is these, which oppose a beneficial check to the excess of one or other of the aforesaid elements, that both form the life of Christianity. Such one-sided tendencies, existing more or less at all times, were found in the period immediately prior to the Reformation; and the

classical studies, which had then once more come into vogue, gave to the rational principle, in many, a melancholy preponderance ; as this may be perceived even in the celebrated, and, in many respects, meritorious, Erasmus. Yet the opposite tendency was, by far, more prevalent, as the rapid diffusion of the Reformation itself will prove, wherein the mystical element had predominated, to the utter exclusion of the contrary one. But after this element, exceeding all bounds, had dissevered the bonds of the Church, the one-sided rational principle, in its turn, detached itself from the Church, pursued its own course, and after many unsuccessful attempts, of a Lewis Hetzer of Bischofzeth in Thurgovia,* of a John Campanus,† of a Michael Servetus,‡ and of a Valentine Gentilis,§ formed a community, which received its name from two Italians of Sienna, Lælius Socinus, who in the year 1562 died at Zurich, and his nephew, Faustus Socinus, who died in 1604, at Luclawicze in Poland.||

* Executed at Constance, in 1529.

† Born in the territory of Juliers, flourished from the year 1520 till 1580, when he was thrown into prison in his own country.

‡ A Spaniard, who at Calvin's instigation was burned at Geneva, in 1553.

§ A Neapolitan, beheaded at Bern, in 1566.

|| On the first authors of Socinianism, the Protestant historian, Turretinus, (in *Compendium Hist. Eccles.* p. 373,) has the following notice : " Antitrinitarii hæc ætate multi occurrunt ; quorum pars maxima Photinianismum et Sabellianismum ; nonnulli etiam Arianismum renovabant. Tales fuere Itali quidam, numero quadragenarium excedente, qui circa annum 1546 in Venetâ ditione prope Vicentiam conventicula et colloquia inter se habebant. In his memorantur Leonardus Abbas Busalis, Lælius Socinus, Senensis Patricius, Bernardinus Ochinus, Nicolaus Paruta, Valentinus Gentilis, Julius Trevisanus, Franciscus de Ruego, Paulus Alciatus, alique. Sed cum detecti essent, imo et duo, J. Trevisanus et Franciscus de Ruego comprehensi

Socinianism and the old orthodox Protestantism are, accordingly, two extremes, whereof the one laid hold of the human, the other of the divine element in Christianity, which is itself one, and so diverged into opposite paths, that Catholicism alone can unite. If, in the Protestant system, the Divinity of Christ be rightly and truly upheld, yet the Humanity of the Redeemer is, by the doctrine of ubiquity, absorbed in His Divinity; but among the Socinians, Christ appears as a mere man. If Luther asserted, that the object of the manifestation of the Son of God, was solely and exclusively the reconciliation of men, with the Deity in the Redeemer's blood; and all the rest, which Jesus taught and wrought, was purely accidental; the Socinians, on the other hand, hold, that Christ has offered up no sacrifice, for the sins of the world, but wished only to deliver unto men a new doctrine, and be to them a model of virtue. Luther and Calvin could set no bounds to the malignant consequences of Adam's sin, that from him had infected his whole posterity; but the two Socini know absolutely nothing of any moral evil, that our great progenitor had brought upon his children. According to the former, God alone worketh the deliverance of man from the empire of Satan, and bringeth him into communion with Christ, and man is, in this process, purely passive; according to the latter, man is alone active, and God, after communicating to him His doctrine and His promises, respecting a future life, leaves him almost entirely to himself. If the old Protestants

et supplicio affecti, cæteri sibi consulturi in varias oras dispersi sunt." Of all these, Valentine Gentilis had the most melancholy fate. After having with difficulty escaped the fiery death, destined by Calvin for him, as well as Servetus, he was condemned, by the Zuinglians of Bern, as an anti-Trinitarian, and beheaded.—*Trans.*

speak only of grace, we hear, on the other hand, from the lips of the Socinians, but the word, laws, and precepts. If it be the custom of the Wittenberg theologians, constantly to despise reason, and if, at the origin of the Reformation, they were scarcely able to endure its name, it is a maxim with the above-mentioned Italians to consult it in every thing, to admit nothing which was impervious to that degree of culture, that it had attained to in their own persons, just as they had stood at the very summit of all attainable knowledge. If we listen to the Reformers, man has only to take the Bible in hand, and its contents, in a magical way, will be conveyed, through the Spirit of God, to his mind; but, if we turn to Lælius and Faustus, they will tell us that, we must understand all the languages in the world, and all the rules and arts of biblical criticism and interpretation, in order to penetrate into the obscurity of Holy Writ. But, if these two species of religious reformers, in the aforesaid, and other like points, pursued courses so totally different, they again frequently concur in other matters. Not only did both promise to restore primitive Christianity, and look upon the Bible, as the only standard and source, from which it was to be drawn, and by which all religious tenets must be tested, but the peculiar starting point of both was also the same. They united in asserting Christianity to have a purely practical tendency, adapted to life; this practical tendency being taken in the narrow, and one-sided signification, as opposed to all speculation and high scientific inquiries. In this matter, however, the other differences between the Reformers and the Socini, exerted, doubtless, a decisive influence; the practical tendency of the former being, in its funda-

mental tone, exclusively religious ; that of the latter, exclusively moral.

Protestantism and Socinianism have this, too, in common ; that as the former checked its own development, and left to later sects, that sprang out of its bosom, the task of carrying out its own principles ; so Socinianism bequeathed to a later period the work of its own consummation,—namely, the entire abandonment of those elements of supernaturalism, which, in its origin, it had not wholly rejected.*

Having now pointed out the historical connexion, between the Protestant and the Socinian systems of doctrine, we shall proceed to state a few historical details. Poland, as hinted above, was the first seat of the Socinians. Here, nearly contemporaneously with the Reformation of Luther and of Calvin, the religious system, which denied the dogma of the Trinity, had penetrated. However much the opponents of the latter doctrine, were in hostility with the partisans of the Reformation, they tolerated each other, lived in mutual concord, and formed together one Protestant community ; a fact, which it is by no means difficult to account for, since the enemies to the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, rendered timid from their small numbers, were for a long time cautious in avowing their sentiments. So soon, however, as their numbers were sufficiently increased, and they had assured themselves of the protection of some powerful patrons, they were no longer able to maintain silence, or to confine their sentiments to a mere whisper. At the synods of Pinczow and Petricow, the two parties separated from

* Moehler here makes an allusion to the Rationalists, who completed the work of destruction, begun by the Socinians.—*Trans.*

each other, in the years 1563 and 1565 ; and, everywhere held in abhorrence, alike by Catholics and Protestants, the Socinians, under the name of Unitarians, formed a separate sect, for the moment, undisturbed from without, yet inwardly divided by the most various opinions. Under these circumstances, Faustus Socinus repaired to them, and succeeded, by degrees, in uniting their discordant views respecting Christ, and in setting aside the anabaptism advocated by the Unitarians. Henceforward the Unitarians exchanged their name for that of Socinians.

In the year 1638, however, their tranquillity was disturbed in Poland also. They saw themselves, partly owing to their own fault, deprived of their school, their church, and their printing-press, in Racovia, where their chief settlement existed ; till at last, chiefly at the instigation of the Jesuits, they were forced to emigrate. The political confederacies of the Unitarians with the Swedes, who had penetrated into Poland, very much contributed to excite general indignation against them. Under the guidance of their leaders, Schlichting, Wisowatius, Przypkovius, and Lubienisky, they endeavoured now to establish settlements in Transylvania, (where already, in the sixteenth century, by means of the Italian physician, Blandrata, Unitarian principles had taken root), and also in Silesia, Prussia, Brandenburg, the Palatinate, and the Netherlands. It was only in Prussia and the March of Brandenburg, that they succeeded in founding some unimportant congregations ; for, the general abhorrence for their principles, and for all attempts to propagate them (even, as in Manheim, where they thought themselves secure), opposed great obstacles to their progress. In the Netherlands, though individual Unitarians were tolerated, they were not

allowed to form congregations at least. The greater part went over, by degrees, to the other Christian communities, among which they lived dispersed. It was in Transylvania only, that the sect maintained itself.

The chief sources of information for the history of Socinianism, are the numerous writings of Faustus Socinus, who made use of the papers bequeathed to him by his uncle ; the writings of John Crell, Jonah Schlichting, John Lewis Wollzogen (the works of all these writers are found in the *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum*), and of several others.

Among the Socinian catechisms, the larger one of Racovia, edited by Moscorovius and Schmalz, in the year 1605, and that by Ostorod, a Socinian preacher at Buscow, near Dantzic, are particularly distinguished. (Rak. 1604.) A regular symbolical writing the Socinians do not recognize ; although the Racovian Catechism may pass for such.

§ LXXXVIII.—Principles of the Socinians, as to the relation between Reason and Revelation, and the functions of the former in the interpretation of Holy Writ.

It is our first duty to state the views of the Socinians, as to the sources of all religious and moral knowledge. They assert, that, through his own powers, man arriveth at the knowledge and distinction of good and evil ;* and, on the other hand, they think that the idea of God, and of divine things, is conveyed to man only from without, to wit, by instruction.† In accordance

* Faust, Socin. Prælect. theol. c. 2 ; Bibliotheca Fr. Pol. tom. i. fol. 537 ; Volkel. de verâ Relig. lib. iv. c. 4.

† Faust. Socin. de auct. Sta. Script. Bibl. Fr. Pol. tom. i. p. 273.

with this theory, they represent the Divine image in man, as consisting in the dominion of the latter over animals. This is avowedly the meanest view, which it is possible to entertain of the affinity to God in man ; a view, which renders it utterly inconceivable, how, when God announces Himself, or lets Himself be announced, from without, man would be even capable of receiving the doctrine on the Deity. Clearer, and yet withal more frivolous and powerless, the one-sided moralizing tendency of Socinianism could not well appear, than in these conceptions, which evidently have in view to represent the ethical principle, as the primary and most deeply-seated idea in man ; and the religious principle, on the other hand, as something subordinate, only extraneously annexed to the mind, only to be grasped by the finite understanding, like the geography of Peru, for instance, and therefore, in a manner, accidental. Thus, while Luther assigns to morality a mere temporal, perishable, earthly value, Socinianism, in the most direct opposition, allots the highest place to it. In the sequel, we shall also see, that the religious is made to minister entirely to the ethical principle. Not less do we, here, recognize the instinctive force, which urged Socinianism to carry out that opposition, that it formed against the elder Protestantism ; the latter, in its extreme sects, representing the divine idea in man (as, for instance, the inward light, the inward Christ of the Quakers), to be so all-powerful as to need no extraneous aid, for its rise and developement in human consciousness ; while, on the other hand, the Socinians will deduce this divine idea *solely* from an external source. The truth is on neither side. Rational nature, the religious, intellectual, and moral capability, is innate in man ; but, in both respects, it needs the out-

ward excitation, proceeding from a being of a like *spiritual* essence, in order to unfold its own energy, and consummate its own history.

One would be inclined to suppose, that, in virtue of these principles, the Socinians would have adhered literally to the sense of any record of revelation, and have embraced it, with unhesitating faith; since they denied to man the capacity, as it were, for any ulterior criticism of such, or the divine similitude, in the true sense of the word. But, in such an expectation we should be totally deceived. There are not, indeed, *wanting* numerous passages, that inculcate an unconditional submission to Holy Writ;* but the very reverse is practised, and the maxim is not only enforced, but clearly avowed; that any thing contrary to reason, that is to say, to the understanding of the Socinians, must not be considered as a doctrine of our records of revelation. Hence the memorable declaration of some Socinians, that in cases, where a Scripture text does not harmonize with what they denominate reason, they should rather invent a sense, than adopt the simple and literal signification of the words.† Hence we find,

* Faust. Socin. Ep. iii. ad Mat. Radec. Bib. Fratrum Pol. tom. i. fol. 386. "Equidem contra id sentio: Nihil in iis Scriptis legi, quod non verissimum sit.....Præstat, mi frater, mihi crede, cum in aliquem Scripturæ locum incidimus, qui nobis falsam sententiam continere videatur, una cum Augustino hæc in parte ignorantiam nostram fateri, quam eum, si alioquin indubitatus plane sit, in dubium revocare." Faustus, after having observed, that if we wish to charge on Holy Writ any untruth, we can do this only through reason, or other grounds, says, "Ratione vix ullo modo fieri id potest, cum Christiana religio non humanæ rationi ullo pacto innitatur."

† Bengel (in *Sushind's Magazine*, No. xv. p. 128) has excellently proved, that the Socinians, in the interpretation of Holy Writ, adopted as a rule, a negative use of reason. The passages relative hereto, ex-

among them, the first outlines of the subsequent accommodation-theory,—a theory which is, indeed, closely connected with the conception they had formed of Christ; for, with the nature of a mere man, an adaptation to errors is perfectly consistent. Yet, this point the Socinians did not fully develope. They did not even uphold the theory of inspiration, in all its rigour; and admitted that errors, though only in unimportant matters, might have crept into the Bible.* From the analogy of the whole Socinian system, especially from the representation it gives of the Holy Spirit, the higher guidance, under which the sacred Scriptures were composed, was, according to these sectaries, merely confined to a Providential ordinance, which permitted only virtuous, honourable, and well-informed men to write the same. That the followers of Socinus should reject tradition, and the authority of the Church, was naturally to be expected.

§ LXXXIX.—Doctrine of the Socinians respecting God, and the person of Christ.

Even in the doctrine of the Divine attributes, the opposition, which the Socinians form to the elder Protestants, is very manifest. If the Reformed (and herein the Lutherans had set them the example) sacrificed the free-will of man to the Divine omniscience, the Socinians, on the other hand, in order to uphold the capacity of self-determination in man, set limits to

tracted from the writings of Faustus Socinus and Schmalz, may be seen in p. 132 of the above-cited work. See also Marheineke Instit. Symbol. p. 172.

* Faust. Socin. de auct. S. Script. Bibl. Fr. Pol. fol. 267.

God's fore-knowledge. The one party annihilates man, the other disfigures the idea of God. The former represents man as so determined that he can no longer be regarded as an independent being ; the latter teaches, that God is determined by man, and subjects the immutable to extraneous influences.

By all the sects, which we have hitherto described, the doctrine respecting the person of the Redeemer, as handed down by the Catholic Church, namely, that he is at once God and man, was ever retained. The Socinians, on the other hand, in this article of belief, departed from the ancient truth in such a way, that the errors they adopted in its room, determine almost all their other deviations. The Father only of Jesus Christ they hold to be God.* They are not, indeed, of opinion, that salvation depends on the denial of the doctrine of the Trinity. On the contrary, distinguishing between truths, the knowledge whereof is absolutely necessary to the gaining of eternal life, and such, the adoption of which is only very useful, they asserted, that the dogma of the unity of God belongs to the first class ; the dogma of the unity of persons to the second ;† yet it is singular, that, at the same time, the Socinians wished to prove, that the unity of person is inseparable from the unity of essence, and, accordingly, from the unity of God.‡ For, hereby, they certainly thought to prove,

* Catechism. Racov. qu. 73. "Quænam est hæc Persona divina? Resp. Est ille Deus unus Domini nostri Jesu Christi Pater."

† Loc. cit. Qu. 53. "Quænam sunt, quæ ad essentiam pertinent, ad salutem prosus necessaria? Resp. Sunt ea, quod Deus sit, quod sit tantum unus," etc. "Qu. 71. Expone, quæ ad eam rem vehementer utilia censeas? Resp. Id quidem est, ut cognoscamus, in essentiâ Dei unam tantum personam esse." Christ. Relig. Instit. Bibl. Fr. Pol. tom. i. fol. 652. Col. ii.

‡ Catech. Rac. Qu. 74. "Demonstra hoc ipsum. Resp. Hoc sane

that the Trinity of persons destroys the unity of nature, and, consequently, that the belief in the unity of person is indispensably necessary to salvation.

The Son of God they hold to be a mere man, who was conceived of the Holy Ghost, and therefore called the Son of God. He also enjoyed the distinction (as the Socinians further teach), to have been, prior to entering on his office, admitted into heaven, where he received his commission relative to mankind. This article of belief the Socinians evidently put forward, not only in order to set aside the difficulties, which several Scripture texts presented,—difficulties, which, on the rejection of Christ's divinity, must have proved very weighty,*—but also because, from the views they entertained as to the origin of religious ideas, they were unable otherwise to explain, how Christ, even according to the meagre conception they had formed of his doctrines, could have attained to his peculiar religious system. On account of his obedience, they proceed to say, he was, after the consummation of his work of redemption, exalted to divine dignity and honour, and all things were given unto him; so that Christians may turn with confidence unto him, as a God, and one invested with Divine power, and may adore him, nay, are bound to do so.† Faustus Socinus was so zealous for

vel hinc patere potest: quod essentia Dei sit una numero, quapropter plures numero personæ in eâ esse nullo pacto possunt," etc.

* Catechism. Rac. qu. 194 and 195.

† Socin. de Justif. Bibl. Fr. Pol. tom. i. fol. 601, Col. i. "Ipsi Jesu tantam in cœlo et in terrâ, tanquam obedientiæ scilicet usque ad mortem crucis insigne præmium, potestatem dedit, ut," etc. Catech. Racov. "Qu. 236. Quid præterea Dominus Jesus huic præcepto addidit? Resp. Id quod etiam Dominum Jesum pro Deo agnoscere tenemur, id est, pro eo, qui in nos potestatem habet divinam, et cui nos divinum exhibere honorem obstricti sumus. Qu. 237. In quo is

the worship of Christ, that Blandrata called him to Transylvania, in order to overcome the repugnance of the consistent Unitarians in that country, who, with reason, were unwilling to offer to any creature an act of adoration. Faustus even fell under suspicion of having contributed, with all his power, towards the imprisonment of Simon David, who was particularly zealous in upholding the consistency of his own religious system. Even in the Racovian Catechism, those are declared unworthy of the Christian name, who testify not, in the aforesaid manner, their homage to Christ.* Once accustomed to admit self-contradictory propositions into their religious system, the Unitarians, who adored Christ, now introduced a distinction in their worship, allotting supreme adoration to God, and an inferior one to Christ.† In this way, they who had resolved to maintain so rigidly the unity of the God-head, admitted, by the side of the one, true, and su-

honor divinus Christo debitus consistit? Resp. In eo, quod quemadmodum adoratione divinâ eum prosequi tenemur, ita in omnibus necessitatibus nostris ejus opem implorare possumus. Adoramus vero eum propter ipsius sublimem et divinam ejus potestatem." Christ. Relig. Instit. fol. 656. Ostorod Instruction, cap. xix. p. 134.

* Catech. Racov. "Qu. 246. Quid vero sentis de iis hominibus, qui Christum non invocant, nec adorandum censent? Resp. Prorsus non esse Christianos sentio, cum Christum non habeant. Et licet verbis id negare non audeant, reipsâ negant tamen."

† Loc. cit. "Qu. 245. Ergo is honor et cultus ad eum modum tribuitur, ut nullum sit inter Christum et Deum hoc in genere discrimen? Resp. Imo permagnum est. Nam adoramus et colimus Deum, tanquam causam primam salutis nostræ; Christum tanquam causam secundam; aut, ut cum Paulo loquamur, Deum tanquam eum, ex quo omnia, Christum ut eum, per quem omnia." Compare the letters to Niemojovius (Bibl. Frat. Pol. tom. ii. fol. 466), where we see, that to Christ a species of invocation is addressed, bearing some resemblance to the Catholic invocation of saints.

preme Deity, a second, unreal, and inferior God, whom, compelled by the clearest texts of Scripture, they resolved to adore; so that they immediately revoked their resolution, as well as enfeebled the doctrine of one God, by the setting up of a second. Had they been acuter thinkers, they must have discerned, that if the Gospel represents the Son as a person, and at the same time as God (and this the Socinians do not pretend to deny),* no other relation between Him and the Father is *conceivable*, but that which the Catholic Church hath from the beginning believed. But what strange theology is this, which can teach, that in the course of ages, God permits a change in the government of the world; so that having, down to the time of Christ, conducted that government in his own person, he now resigned it, just as if he had been weary of it, and appointed a vicegerent, to whom he probably communicated omnipotence, certainly, at least, omniscience, and such like attributes; just as if things of this kind could, without any difficulty, be transferred, and, as it were, appended to any individual!

It is remarkable, that man, when he has once formed a mean conception of his calling, can rarely rise in speculation, as in will, above the point of elevation, which that conception had fixed. Whoever imagines, that he is absolutely incapable of satisfying certain moral claims, will certainly never act up to them in life; and whoever obstinately persists in the prejudice, that his powers are unequal to any speculative problem, will assuredly never solve it. Would it not appear, that such so-called fancies, at times, at least, determine

* Christ. Relig. Instit. loc. cit. fol. 655. The words of St. John's Gospel, i. 1 to 20, 21, are here cited.

instinctively the measure of intellectual power in those, who possess them? It was so with Socinus. The Divine similitude, the highest faculty in man, that wherein the real man alone consists, he places in the calling to hold dominion over animals. From all the specimens we have given of his religious system, we see a man before us, who judges of Divine things, like a shepherd, a goat-herd, or a cow-herd; but we see no theologian. The following way of dealing with Scriptural texts by Socinus, is certainly not calculated to overturn the judgment we have pronounced upon his very narrow-minded views. In order to get rid of the proof, which may be so strictly drawn in favour of the pre-existence of Christ, from those words of John (i. 1), "In the beginning was the Word," the two Socini thus interpreted this passage: "In the beginning of John's preaching, Christ already was the envoy of God." On that text, "Before Abraham was, I am" (John vi. 58), they foisted the following sense: "Before Abram becometh Abraham, I am the light of the world!" As the change of name of the aforesaid patriarch was connected with the promise, that he should be the father of many nations, but as, before Christ, he was the father only of one nation, and it was only through the latter many nations entered into the relation of sonship to him, so the Saviour wished to say, before Abram, in fact, merits the name of Abraham, I will be the light of the world; for, I am destined by God to be the mediator of the transformation of the one name into the other! That Christ is termed by John the Creator of the world, they denied; because the text, "Through Him all things were made," &c., was to be referred to the new creation occasioned by Him.* Yet it is not

* Catech. Rac. Qu. 107, 128. Oeder, a Protestant Dean, whose

here our business to bring forward the exegetical arguments, which the Socinians advance, in support of their doctrines; we shall therefore return to the exposition of their peculiar tenets.

The Holy Ghost, they represent as a power and efficacy of the Deity; but the more exact description they give of this power, will claim our attention later.* The question has often been proposed, with what ancient heresy doth the Socinian conception of Christ agree? It would be easy to discover many points of resemblance with ancient sects; but the Socinians are unable to show a perfect concurrence with any one. With the Arians they, doubtless, agreed in the veneration and worship of one, who became a God—who was a mere creature. But the heretics of the fourth century taught, that the Son of God existed before the world, and that through him the universe was created, and from the beginning governed; a doctrine which their friends, in the sixteenth century, called in question, since they represented the existence of the Saviour as, in every respect, commencing with his earthly nativity;

edition of the Racovian Catechism, in the year 1739, I make use of, says, at p. 146, at the question 107, as follows: “*Perversio clarissimi loci (John vi. 58) ita foeda et simul manifesta est, ut fieri non potuisse credam, ut homines sanæ alioquin mentis, in eas cogitationes inciderent, nisi qui ob objectum amorem veritatis in reprobum sensum traditi sunt.*” He is right. Compare *Christ. Relig. Instit. Bibl. Frat. Pol. tom. i. fol. 656.*

* *Catech. Racov. “Qu. 271. Spiritum Sanctum non esse in Deitate personam, et hinc discere potes,” etc. Christ. Relig. Instit. ii. fol. 652, Coll. ii. “Quid, quæro, de Spiritû sancto nunc mihi dicis? Resp. Nempe, illum non esse personam aliquam, a Deo, cujus est Spiritus, distinctam, sed tantummodo ipsius, Dei vim et efficaciam quandam,” etc. What an absurd answer, in more than one respect! In general, the whole catechetical exposition is very unsuccessful.*

and therefore could not teach a creation of the world by him, and even dated from his ascension, only his government of the world, which, even now, according to them, is of a limited nature.

With the Artemonites the Socinians willingly associated themselves; and about the period of their first rise, others (as, for instance, the author of the *Augsburg Confession*), compared the Unitarians with the disciples of Paul of Samosata. The affinity is, doubtless, not to be denied, since all these families of heretics held Christ to be a mere man, who was conceived of the Divine Spirit, and was sent to men, with a Divine commission. But if the Socinians denied, that before his birth from Mary, Christ had already existed, and was a secondary Lord of the universe (and by this denial they take a position below the Arians), the Artemonites, on the other hand, together with the disciples of Paul of Samosata, rejected even the doctrine, that Christ, after his ascension, was exalted to Divine dignity, and to the government of the world; and hereby fell as far below the Socinians, as these fall below the Arians. Some disciples of Artemon, as well as of Theodotus, rejected, as a later interpolation, the beginning of the Gospel of St. John, and were therefore called Alogi; while Artemon himself asserted, that, before Pope Zephyrinus, Christ was not held to be God. Paul of Samosata suppressed the hymns, wherein Christ was addressed as God, and thereby endeavoured to prevent the worship of Christ. The Socinians, accordingly, occupy the middle place between the Arians and the disciples of Artemon; and have something in common with the errors of all these sectaries, without, however, entirely coinciding with them.

They are also wont to be placed in the same category

with the Photinians. But as these taught, that in Christ there was an union of the Logos, whom they conceived to be impersonal, with the man Jesus, they herein differed from the doctrine of the Socinians. They preached up, moreover, that the kingdom of the Redeemer would have an end; that the union of the Logos with the man Jesus would again be dissolved, and thereby the dominion of Christ cease; whereas the reverse of this was inculcated by the Socinians.

§ xc.—On the Fall and the Regeneration of Man.

With reason the Socinians assert, that, by the creation, Adam was endowed with free-will, which, in consequence of the Fall, he forfeited neither for himself nor for his posterity; for it is essentially inherent in human nature. Adam, moreover, they say, was created mortal in himself; yet so, that if he had persevered in his obedience to God, he was not under the necessity of dying. Immortality would have been vouchsafed to him, as a gratuitous gift. Original sin, they contend, there is none; and the consequences of Adam's fall extend not beyond his person, with the exception of a certain defectiveness, which occasions death to extend to all his posterity. This was a concession, which the undeniable phenomena of ordinary life wrung from the Socinians; but in their religious system, this concession is so isolated, as to be utterly untenable.*

Corresponding to their notion of the moral malady of mankind, was that of the remedies, which they represented Christ to have proffered us against it. These the Socinians make to consist, in the granting of

* Catech. Racov. Qu. 422, 42, 45.

a purer and more perfect legislation, as well as in the opening the prospect of a future life, confirmed, as it is, by Christ's resurrection, and which, according to them, was not covenanted in the Old Testament, but now only is promised to penitent sinners, and to the observers of the moral precepts.* The Socinians saw themselves compelled to circumscribe, as much as was practicable, the ethical and religious knowledge, and hopes of the ancient world; for, otherwise, there would scarcely have remained any thing, for which, as Christians, we were bounden in gratitude to God and to Christ. How, otherwise, was Christ to be distinguished from the prophets? Hence, they allege even the Lord's Prayer, among the especial revelations, which, through Christ, the Deity hath vouchsafed to men. And had they known that the Saviour found this form of prayer already existing, and only strongly recommended it, then their account of the peculiar services of the envoy of God, would have occupied a totally imperceptible space.† The most remarkable, indirect, act of Christ must, according to the Socinian system, when we closely investigate the matter, be evidently the abolition of the ritual and legal ordinances of the Mosaic dispensation; an abolition, to which they refer the establishment of a more spiritual worship of the Deity. But this is a

* Catech. Racov. "Qu. 197. Quid vero hoc novum fœdus comprehendit? Resp. Duplex rerum genus, quorum unum Deum, alterum nos respicit. Qu. 198. Sunt perfecta mandata et perfecta Dei promissa," etc. Socin. de Justif. Bibl. Frat. Pol. tom. i. fol. 601, Col. i. Resp. ad object. Cuteni. Bibl. Frat. Pol. tom. ii. fol. 454, n. q.

† Loc. cit. "Qu. 217. Quid vero ad hæc addidit Dominus Jesus?" (Namely, to the commandment in the Old Testament, to worship God alone.) "Resp. Primum hoc, quod nobis certam orandi rationem præscripsit," etc.

merit of Christ, which, after all that the prophets of the old law had taught upon the subject, is certainly, in respect to the novelty, at least, of its fundamental idea, not to be so highly estimated.

Thus, admitting no vicarious satisfaction on the part of Christ—no imputation of his merits, which they reject as pernicious to morality—the Socinians know only of a certain meagre communication of Divine power supporting human exertion, and cooperating with it; a power, whereof we must, beforehand, form only a very modest idea.* The Holy Ghost, whose personality they deny, as was above stated, is, according to them, even in its workings, very far from corresponding to the idea which Scripture, and the perpetual faith of the Church, give of it. They divide his gifts into two classes, into temporal and extraordinary, under which they include the apostolic power of miracles,† and into permanent, which they term the Gospel, and the sure hope of eternal life.‡ The former they designate as the outward, the latter as the internal gift of the Holy Ghost. In order that no one might deem the Holy Spirit necessary for the formation of Christian faith, and, consequently, for the beginning of all true virtue in man, the Racovian Catechism devotes a special question and answer to the denial of this opinion.§ Nay, whether the internal operation of the Divine Spirit be necessary, for implanting in the soul a firm hope of eternal life, is a matter of doubt to the authors of this Catechism; for they make use of the

* Socin. de Justif. loc. cit. fol. 601; Relig. Christ. Instit. loc. cit. fol. 665; Catech. Racov. Qu. 374.

† Catech. Racov. Qu. 361.

‡ Loc. cit. Qu. 365, seq. 430.

§ Loc. cit. Qu. 370.

expression, it *seemeth* that the outward promise afforded us, by the preaching of the Gospel, needs an inward sealing in our hearts.

As regards the fulfilment of the moral law, the above-mentioned inward gift of the Holy Ghost is limited, solely, to cases of peculiarly grievous temptation.* In illustration of this doctrine of the Catechism, the following propositions, taken from a series of answers, made by Faustus Socinus to the objections, which a certain Cutenus had proposed to him, deserve to be cited. "Every man," says this Reformer, "in case he be not corrupted by his associates, can live without sin, when the most attractive and stimulating recompense be promised to him, as the reward of his virtues. But, such a recompense is promised in the Gospel; therefore, he can perfectly conform his life to the precepts of Jesus." To this the still stronger proposition is subjoined: "Man, not, indeed, by his natural strength, but by the powers afforded to him by God, through the hope of eternal life, can act up to the Divine will."† Hence we see, that the opposition between natural and supernatural powers, in the Socinian system, has, in part, quite another signification, than it has ever received in the Church, and still retains among Protestants, as well as Catholics. This phenomenon, moreover, is grounded in the fact, that, according to Socinus, man has no innate sense of religion—not even the slightest sense of the immortality of his own soul: for the doctrine of immortality is represented as one in

* Loc. cit. Qu. 368.

† No. 6. "Homo in hac vitâ non quidem viribus naturalibus, sed viribus sibi à Deo per spem vitæ æternæ tantum subministratis, potest ejusdem voluntatem perficere."

every respect extrinsically communicated — supernaturally revealed; and therefore he denominates even belief in it a supernatural power. Further below, Socinus recurs to the same subject, improving, as it were, on himself. The Christian, according to him, by calling to mind eternal life, can rise again, by his own strength, even from a grievous fall; yet nothing is safer and more praiseworthy,* says he, than to turn to God, for, one ought not to trust too confidently in one's own powers. But a vicious life, he continues to say, man, without a special favour and grace of God, is not able to reform. The question, however, arises, whether to this grace we are to attach the orthodox notion; or whether, on the contrary, we are not to understand, by this special favour, the judgments of God?† How extremely similar the sentiments of the Socinians are to those of the Pelagians, must be evident to all minds.

Christ also, according to the Socinians, still exerts, after his ascension, a perpetual influence over our destiny. But the influence which he exercises, they represent as only external. He protects us, they say, by the fulness of his power; and, in a *certain degree*, turns away from us the wrath of God, which is wont to be poured out against sinners: and this it is, we understand, by his intercession. He sets before us, in his own person, the blessed effects of virtue; but this is to be referred, solely, to the reading of the Gospel history, that has been bequeathed to us, and by means whereof he constantly worketh. Lastly, he purifies from sin by punishments and aids. The notion of the latter, by being associated with punishments, is necessarily con-

* "Laudabilis et securus."

† Bibl. Fr. Pol. tom. ii. fol. 454.

fined to the granting of earthly prosperity, as an encouragement to virtue.* Hence the Socinians assert, that Christ discharges his priestly functions solely in heaven, and his sufferings and ministry on earth have only procured for him, this, his celestial influence.

From all we have now stated, the notion which the Socinians connect with justification, may easily be inferred. That they would avoid the errors of the Lutherans and the Calvinists, on this matter, may naturally be expected; but it is equally certain, that they rush into the opposite excess. Justification they conceive to be a judicial act of God, whereby He graciously absolves from sin and its guilt, all men, who, with faith in Christ fulfil the moral precepts.† This definition would be very just, if the Christian obedience required by them were not, from its very nature, even in the best case, purely finite; for, it usually is begun only by the natural powers; and to Christ scarcely any other share is allotted therein, save that of a credible and trustworthy guide. In other respects, what the Socinians advance touching justifying faith, that it possesses in itself, as an essential form, a power efficacious in works, and can be separated from the same only in

* Catech. Rac. Qu. 479.

† Socin. de Justif. loc. cit. 602, Col. ii. “Justificatio nostra coram Deo, ut uno verbo dicam, nihil est aliud, quam à Deo pro justis haberiRatio igitur, quâ nobis illa contingit, ad nos respicit. Quod ad Deum attinet, nihil Deum movet ad nos pro justis habendos, nihilne, ut tantum bonum consequamur in Deo esse necesse est, præter gratuitam voluntatem.....Quod vero ad nos pertinet, non aliter reipsâ justi coram Deo habemur, et delictorum nostrorum veniam ab ipso consequimur, quam si in Jesum Christum credamus.....Credere autem in Jesum Christum, nihil aliud est, quam Jesu Christo confidere, et idcirco ex ejus præscripto vitam instituere.” Catech. Racov. Qu. 452, an ill-composed article.

thought, is very good, and has been borrowed from the Catholic schools (*fides formata*). It is only to be lamented, that the, in itself, very laudable earnestness, which applied its energy to moral conduct, should have been devoid of the Divine blessing and unction; and we are at a loss to discover how it can attain its ends.*

Directed by the truest instinct, the Socinians further assert, that works, or obedience to the Divine precepts, do not, of themselves, merit heaven; for, as in the performance of these, they refer the larger share to human exertion, and therefore admit no truly Divine works, it does honour to their understanding to have allowed no inward relation to eternal bliss, in works founded in such a principle. But if they perceived this, it is then the more inconceivable, how they could deem man capable of future rewards, since with these, according to their system, his earthly feelings and actions possess no true affinity and uniformity. Even from this point of view, they might have discerned the unsatisfactoriness of their own system, and have been brought round to the doctrine of the Church.†

In respect to the concurrence of the Socinian view of justification, with the Catholic and the Protestant belief, as well as its divergence from the doctrine of

* Socin. loc. cit. fol. 610, Col. ii. "Fides obedientiam præceptorum Dei, non quidem ut effectum suum, sed ut suam substantiam et formam continet atque complectitur. Meminisse enim debemus ejus, quod supra recte conclusum est, fidem, hanc scilicet, quâ justificamur, Dei obedientiam esse." Compare de Christo Salvatore. Bibl. Frat. Pol. tom. ii. P. i. c. iv. fol. 129; P. iv. c. xi. fol. 234. These passages, as containing the refutation of the Protestant doctrine on faith and works, have an especial importance; and many remarks are, contrary to all expectation, acute and ingenious.

† Socin. fragment. de Justific. loc. cit. fol. 620.

either Church, we shall here make a few brief observations. The Socinians agree with Luther and Calvin, in holding Justification to be a mere judicial act of God. To justify, according to them, signifies only to acquit—to declare men just. But, both parties stand in direct hostility one to the other, inasmuch as the former make this Divine declaration to follow upon sanctification; the latter, on the contrary, deduce sanctification only from the belief in this declaration. Catholics reconcile these contrarieties, by teaching, that sanctification and forgiveness of sins concur in the one act of justification. While the Protestants hold, that for the sake of Christ's merits, heaven is thrown open to the believer, in despite of his sins; that not moral worth, but only grace, decides our salvation, in order that praise may be rendered unto God alone; while the Socinians, on the other hand, maintain, that merit of Christ there is none, but only merits on the part of man, and therefore no *real* grace in Christ, because otherwise moral exertions would be paralysed; the Catholic Church lays hold on the truth in both parties, and, at the same time, rejects the errors of either; as she inculcates, that by grace man can and must let himself be moved, exalted, and thoroughly purified in morals; and only inasmuch as he doth this, hath he a living conception of the institution of grace, and doth he place himself in due relation to it. That, however, Protestantism is far more fitted than the system of the two Socini (much as the latter may perpetually exalt morality), to call forth moral exertion, and to found a pure morality, although Protestantism misapprehends its nature, and doth not truly understand its due relation to religion, is a truth, which cannot be called in question. Socinianism is utterly wanting in humility,

and in all deeper insight into the great necessities of human nature, since in man, even in his present condition, it finds nothing essentially amiss ; and accordingly, it is deficient in the vivifying and morally inspiring principle. A mere lawgiver, as Christ mainly appears to the Socinians, cannot exert a deep and powerful influence on man. They protest, indeed, against the notion, that they regard Christ exclusively in this light, since they consider the deliverance of the human race, as the true object of his mission, and they look upon his legislation, as only a means to that higher end.* Doubtless, it is precisely so ; but it is this very one-sided view of the means selected by God, which forms the great gulph between Socinian Christianity, and the old genuine Christianity. The Socinians want the Emanuel ; and, therefore, all which for eighteen hundred years hath wrought the great moral renovation of the world. How weak, how impotent, is their legislative Jesus, compared with the Son of God, reconciling, by his self-immolation, the world with his Father ! *The Son of God* it is, who hath overthrown heathenism, and tamed barbarism. And what means the vague expression, “ deliver ” ? From what was he to deliver ? From a moral corruption, that was unavoidable, since no one before Christ, Jew or Gentile, was, according to the Socinians, instructed in the relations of the present to a future life ? At most, by the word “ deliverance,” can here be understood only the liberation from *inculpable* ignorance, and therefore from guiltless immorality also.

* Faust. Socin. Respons. ad object. Cut. loc. cit. “ Nec sane ob id præcipue in mundum venit, ut legem ferret, nosterve legislator esset, sed ut nos servaret, in quem etiam finem suam legem dedit.”

§ XCI.—On the Sacraments.

The sacraments of baptism and of the altar, the Socinians hold to be mere ceremonies; as, indeed, from their rejection, or, at least, misapprehension of the inward operations of grace, such a view necessarily follows. Baptism is regarded only as a rite of initiation, of the carnal Jews and Heathens into the Christian Church; for, these needed an outward symbol of the forgiveness of sins, and of inward purification. As regards its retention in the Christian Church, this is considered by the Socinians to have arisen out of a misunderstanding of the mere temporary ordinance of Christ. To children, moreover, baptism is inapplicable, for these certainly comprehend not the nature of the act. These sectaries deem it a great concession, on their parts, when they refrain from damning those, who administer baptism to infants; and this, with them, is certainly not surprising, since they deny original sin, and naturally look on the sprinkling with mere water as a ceremony in itself void.*

Of the Lord's supper they believe, at least, so much, that it hath been instituted for all ages; but, indeed, *only* to announce the death of the Lord.†

Lastly, the Socini taught an annihilation of the damned, and accordingly rejected the eternity of hell-torments.

* Catech. Rac. Qu. 346-351.

† Loc. cit. Qu. 333. It appears perfectly superfluous to allege any testimonies, on this matter, from the writings of Socinus and others.

CHAPTER VI.

THE ARMINIANS, OR REMONSTRANTS.

§ XCII.—Some historical preliminary remarks.

THIS sect, as has been already observed in the Introduction, owes its name and origin to an inhabitant of South Holland, who, in the year 1560, was born in Oudewater. The very solid and extensive learning, which he had acquired at several learned academies at home and abroad,—especially his philosophic studies at Paris and at Padua,—certainly made him acquainted with the dogma of free-will, and the doctrines connected therewith; so that, he must have entertained doubts, as to the truth of his own confession, and the divine origin it laid claim to. Yet, he would scarcely have resolved to take up an attitude of formal opposition, against the doctrine of his Church, had not, even contrary to his hesitating will, a concurrence of circumstances determined him thereto. The parties of the Supralapsarians and the Infralapsarians, already stood opposed to each other, in battle array. The former asserted, that, prior to the fall, the predestination to eternal felicity and damnation was already decreed; the latter, that it was so only subsequently to that event. The Supralapsarians alone, as is evident, maintained Calvin's doctrine in all its rigour. Under these circumstances, it happened, unfortunately, that while Arminius was pastor of a congregation, he received the commission to refute some Calvinistic ad-

versaries of the rigid doctrine of predestination ; and the investigation which he then undertook, led him to a still more decided rejection of what he had been called upon to defend. As professor of theology at Leyden, he found in his opponents, particularly Gomar, adverse spies, who took offence at anything, which in any, even the slightest, degree betrayed an opposition to the harsh Calvinistic theory of election, and summoned him, in consequence, to an account. Thus was Arminius led to express his opinions, ever more clearly and distinctly ; and, in proportion as this occurred, the partisans of his views increased, and, consequently, the fermentation among the Calvinists of the United States augmented. The civil authorities soon saw themselves forced to take cognizance of the prevailing controversies ; but, the attempts at conciliation, which they deemed the most suited to their position, proved abortive.

Arminius died in the year 1609 ; but his principles survived him, and found in Uytenbogart and Simon Episcopius, defenders not less able than courageous. Accused of a departure from the formularies of the national Faith, and of disturbing the peace of the country, they delivered to the States, in the year 1610, a remonstrance, which, in five articles, embodied their principles. From this declaration, they derived the name of Remonstrants. At last, after repeated, but ever ineffectual, attempts on the part of the civil authorities, to bring about a pacific adjustment of these disputes, the adversaries of the Remonstrants, especially after Maurice, Prince of Orange, had declared in their favour, succeeded, in the year 1618, in convoking the Synod of Dort. Condemned by that Synod as heretics, all Arminians were, in consequence, deprived of their

places, and even banished the country ; till at length, after the death of Prince Maurice, they came by degrees to be tolerated again, and even, as a separate ecclesiastical community, were insured a legal existence.

We shall describe their doctrinal peculiarities after the Confession, which Simon Episcopius published in the year 1622, under the title *Confessio sive Declaratio sententiæ Pastorum, qui in fœderato Belgio Remonstrantes vocantur*, etc. Its author soon saw himself induced to put forth a defence of his declaration ; for some rigid Calvinistic preachers had published a censure on it. The Apology, termed *Examen Censuræ*, etc., is distinguished by the most dexterous logic, and would well serve to illustrate the confession of the Remonstrants, had this stood in need of illustration. For, the latter is written with the utmost clearness and vigour, and only in respect to certain points, is deficient in that explicitness, which should characterise a public formulary. In these rare cases, the Apology, or *Examen Censuræ*, will be very serviceable, for in it, the Arminians were forced to make the most unreserved declarations.

§ XCIII.—Doctrine of the Arminians.

The subject of the controversy, between the Arminians and the Gomarists, turned, doubtless, more immediately on Calvin's doctrine of predestination. But, as may easily be conceived, a series of other dogmas were soon involved in this dispute ; for, the aforesaid error doth not stand isolated, but, in part, presupposes, and is grounded on other notions, or rather mistakes ; and, in part, has them in its train. But, as the con-

troversy arose on the question of absolute election, we shall commence, with the exposition of the Arminian doctrine, on that subject, and then set forth the other points, on which it exerted an influence.

Against the rigid Calvinistic theory of predestination, the Arminians not only alleged, that, thereby, God was made the author of moral evil, but, they very acutely observed, that, by this theory, Christ's death of atonement would be deprived of all power and efficacy, nay, become utterly inexplicable. For, they said, if, from all eternity, the salvation of the elect hath been unconditionally and immutably decreed, it would ensue in virtue of that decree, and not for the sake of Christ's merits: and as to the reprobate, Christ, undoubtedly, could not have appeared on their behalf; since God did not, and could not, seriously wish for their salvation, as this would be in utter contradiction with their eternal destination to misery.*

The doctrines of Calvin, in respect to the elect and the reprobate, as combated by the Arminians, stood by no means isolated. They changed the idea of a government of the world, and a providential guidance of all things, into the conception of a destiny, whereby all the movements of creatures are absolutely fettered. For, there could be no conceivable interest, in withdrawing any thing from the circle of necessity, when the felicity and misery of spirits had once been absolutely decreed; and any conception of final causes, as to what might yet be reserved to Free-Will, became utterly impossible. For, to deny to man moral liberty, and leave him a so-called political freedom, as the Lutheran

* *Confessio sive Declaratio*, etc. Herdewici, 1622-4, p. 31. See the defence in the *Examen Censuræ*, p. 104, b.

Formularies do, is to betray the most singular levity ; as, when once the kernel has been taken away, no interest can attach to the wretched husk ; and in the world of man, every thing hath a moral relation. Accordingly, the Remonstrants, in their Confession, devoted a particular section to the article on Providence, attaching thereto the notion of a wise, holy, and just guidance (not predetermination) of all things ; and, in this way, they conceived they steered the true middle course between the Epicurean system of casualty, and the Stoical and Manichean destiny, or *Fatum* ; for, with the latter, they associated the errors of predestinarianism.*

To man, therefore, they ascribe free-will, which is so inherent in his nature, that it can never be obliterated.† The fall of the first man is in necessary connexion with this, represented not as a mere spontaneous, but as a perfectly free act.‡ As an immediate consequence of the Fall, we see stated the loss of true righteousness, and of the felicity it insured. Adam was doomed to the eternal misery, and the manifold temporal misfortunes, wherewith he had been menaced ; and his posterity, in consequence of their ties of relationship, with

* Loc. cit. c. vi. pp. 19-23.

† Loc. cit. p. 22. “*Naturalem tamen rerum contingentiam atque innatam arbitrii humani libertatem, olim semel in creatione datam, nunquam per ipsam (providentiam) tollit (Deus), sed rerum naturas ordinario salvas relinquit : atque ita cum hominis voluntate in agendo concurrat, ut ipsam quoque pro suo genio agere, et libere suas partes obire sinat : nec proinde præcisam bene, nedum male, agendi necessitatem eidem unquam imponit.*”

‡ Loc. cit. c. viii. § 2, p. 24. “*Transgressus est, inquam, non spontaneâ, tantum, sed prorsus liberâ voluntate.*”

their common progenitor, incurred the same fate. As the Confession adds, that actual sins increase guilt in the sight of God, obscure at first the understanding in spiritual things, then render it, by degrees, totally blind, and, at last, through the habit of sin, entirely corrupt the will ; it follows, that the Arminians did not conceive original sin, in itself, had bereaved man of *all* his faculties for good.* By such an opinion, in fact, their opposition to the doctrine of absolute predestination, would have become utterly untenable.

Redemption in Christ Jesus is, according to the Arminian system, universal. To every man, who heareth the Gospel, sufficient grace is proffered, to enable him to rise from his fall ; and where the announcement of the doctrines of salvation, is not attended with these effects, man only is to blame. If, on the other hand, grace prevails (*gratia efficax*), then the reason of this is to be sought for, not in its intrinsic nature, but in the reception, which it has found in the soul of man. An irresistibly working grace is therefore, according to the Arminian system, totally inadmissible. With reason they assert, that its notion is at utter variance with the rewards promised to obedience when rendered, and with the penalties threatened against the refusal of obedience, for God would in that case extort obedience, and would work exclusively and alone. It were absurd, and contrary to all reason, they add, to promise any one a recompense, as if he had freely obeyed, and yet wring obedience from him, as from a slave. On the other hand, they finally observe, it were cruel to inflict an eternal punishment on the disobedient, who yet cannot obey ;

* Loc. cit. § 5, p. 25.

for they want the irresistible Grace, under the condition whereof, alone, obedience can be rendered.*

But if the Remonstrants reject these Calvinistic views of grace, they yet willingly retain those doctrines respecting it, without which the character of Christianity cannot be preserved. The grace of God, according to them, determines the beginning, the progress, and the consummation of all good. Their articles of belief on these points are nearly identical with the Catholic; and therefore, like the Council of Trent, they speak of a resuscitating grace, which only awakens the dormant powers yet existing in fallen man,† in opposition to the Lutheran theory, according to which the higher faculties must first be created anew in him.

With the clearest consciousness of their object, and with a genuine scientific insight into, and prosecution of their task, the Remonstrants defined the notion of faith also. As the usual Protestant conception of the same excludes the idea of free-will, and is based on

* Loc. cit. c. xvii. pp. 55-58, § 7. "Gratiam tamen divinam aspernari et respuere, ejusque operationi resistere homo potest, ita ut seipsum, cum divinitus ad fidem et obedientiam vocatur, inidoneum reddere queat ad credendum, et divinæ voluntati obediendum," etc.

† Loc. cit. c. xvii. § 16, p. 37. "Gratiam itaque Dei statuimus esse principium et complementum omnis boni: adeo ut ne ipse quidem regeneritus absque præcedente istâ, sive præveniente, excitante, prosequente, et cooperante gratiâ, bonum ullum salutare cogitare, velle aut peragere possit: nedum ullis ad malum trahentibus tentationibus resistere. Ita ut fides, conversio, et bona opera omnia, omnesque actiones piæ et salutares, quas quis cogitando assequi potest, gratiæ Dei in Christo, tanquam causæ suæ principali et primariæ, *in solidum* sint adscribendæ." When the expression "*in solidum*" is here used, so the reader should remember the expression which Dr. Eck employed in the disputation at Leipzig, who very well observed, that the *totum* of regeneration is to be ascribed to God, but only not *totaliter*.

the assumption of the impracticability of the law, the Arminians, having once embraced the true doctrine of free-will, were necessarily compelled to assail the favourite opinion of the Reformers, as to the saving nature of Faith without works. He, who believeth in a way acceptable to God, is, in their opinion, one, who, converted to the precepts of the Gospel, is filled with contrition for the sins he hath committed, and is inwardly renewed. They observe, as Paul teacheth, that faith is imputed to man for righteousness; and James, that "by works a man is justified, and not by faith only;" as the Epistle to Timothy promises to godly behaviour, rewards in this and in the next life; and as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews moreover declares, that without being sanctified, no one shall see God; it follows that the saving faith, required by the Gospel, is certainly no other, than that which, from its very essence, includes in itself obedience; is the fruitful parent of all good works, and the source and the root of all Christian piety and sanctification. Hence they sum up their belief in these words,—the true saving or salutary faith, is that "which worketh by charity."*

The following five acts of God, according to the Remonstrants, denote the history of the sinner, who hath already obeyed the Divine call, been converted to faith, and, under the assistance of grace, fulfilleth the Divine precepts. The first is *election*, whereby the true believers are separated from the profane multitude of those who perish, and are marked off as the property

* Loc. cit. c. x. xi. pp. 33-38. "Fides salvifica." The expression "fides justificans" (according to the *Examen Censur.* p. 107, b), they do not make use of.

of God. Election is followed by *adoption*, whereby the regenerated are received into the family of God, and fully admitted to the rights of the celestial heritage, which in its due time will be awarded. *Justification* is then described, as the gracious absolution from all sin, by means of a faith, "working by charity" in Jesus Christ, and in his merits; and *Sanctification* is distinguished from Justification as the fourth act of God. Sanctification the Remonstrants conceive to be a perfect, inward separation of the sons of God from the children of this world. Lastly, *the Sealing* through the Holy Spirit, as the fifth Act of God, they represent as the firmer and more solid confirmation in true confidence, in the hope of heavenly glory, and in the assurance of Divine grace.* Of the last periods in the internal history of the regenerated man, the Arminians formed so high a conception, that they say of him, he can no longer sin; for the words in the first Epistle of John, iii. 4, and v. 18, they apply to him. Nevertheless, they protest against the notion, that the believer, who is exalted to this high degree of perfection, is no longer guilty of any, even the slightest, fault, that may be bottomed in error, frailty, and infirmity, especially under grievous temptations.†

It was natural to suppose, that the Gomarists would charge this doctrine of conversion, with declaring war against the whole Protestant Church, and with being Catholic, or even Socinian; but it can scarcely be conceived, that the Remonstrants would deny the charge.‡ For so soon as we overlook unessential points, and a diversity of expression, the unprejudiced observer must

* Loc. cit. c. xviii. p. 59

† Loc. cit. c. ii. p. 37.

‡ Examen Censuræ, loc. cit. p. 107, *et seq.*

perceive the most striking concurrence with the Catholic doctrine. Against their agreement with Catholics, the Remonstrants appeal principally to the circumstance of their declaring justification to be a judicial act, whereby God releases the sinner from the merited punishments ; whereas Catholics regard it, as an inward newness of life, wrought by the Deity. But under one act, which they call Justification, Catholics comprehend the Divine forgiveness of sins ; whereas the Remonstrants divide this one act into a series of acts, which cannot be defended on scriptural grounds. But their opposition to the Calvinists and Lutherans consists herein, that they assert a true and inward deliverance from sin, through regeneration, and do not recognize any imputation of Christ's righteousness, through faith only, in opposition to *Christian* works and to *Christian* charity. Next, they place their divergence from Catholics in the difference of ideas, which both attach to faith : for they asserted of themselves, they regarded good works as only the fruits of faith, and this the Catholics were not wont to do. Were then the Arminians ignorant, that Catholics deduce charity from faith, and from both, good works, as their common fruits ? In many particular definitions of the Arminians, moreover, the influence of Socinian principles is very manifest ; and, on this account, they incurred the charge of Socinianism, which, however, was very unfounded. It was Hugo Grotius, a Remonstrant, who, against the assaults of the Socinians, had defended the doctrine of the vicarious satisfaction !

§ XCIV.—Doctrine of the Arminians on the Sacraments.

The Remonstrants admit only two sacraments, and consider them as signs of covenant, by means whereof God symbolizes His promised blessings, and communicates and seals them *in a certain way*; and the faithful, on their part, publicly declare they will embrace them with a true, firm, and obedient faith, and bear the same in lasting and grateful remembrance.* As the expression, “communicate in a certain way,” is evidently very obscure and indefinite, the Gomarists solicited a fuller explanation, which, after a long and dilatory parley, turned out to be this: that, touching the mode of efficacy in the sacraments, nothing was really known, and no internal communication of grace, connected with their reception, could be admitted. That, moreover, from Holy Writ the notion of a sealing of the Divine promises, through the sacraments, can be deduced, was even called in question.†

These definitions could not fail to incur strong censure; and they were even charged, as regarded baptism, with bearing perfect resemblance to the maxims of the Anabaptists. In fact, there was, according to these principles, no longer a rational ground for baptizing infants; nay, baptism administered to them must needs

* Confess. Remonstr. c. xxxiii. p. 70. “Sacramenta cum dicimus, externas ecclesiæ ceremonias, seu ritus illos sacros et solennes intelligimus, quibus fœderalibus signis ac sigillis visibilibus Deus gratiosa beneficia sua in fœdere præsertim evangelico promissa, non modo nobis representat et adumbrat, sed et certo modo exhibet et obsignat: nosque vicissim palam publiceque declaramus ac testamur, nos promissiones omnes divinas verâ, firmâ atque obsequiosâ fide amplecti et beneficia ipsius jugi et gratâ semper memoriâ celebrare velle.”

† Exam. Cens. p. 245, *et seq.*

be regarded as superstitious. Even Episcopius, in his *Examination of the Censure*, could give no other reply, than that infant baptism was not discontinued in his sect, as it was of high antiquity, and its abolition would certainly be attended with great scandal.* Yet a rite, which, in itself, was held to be senseless and meaningless, and was retained merely out of respect for custom, could not long endure. And, in fact, we find, that the Remonstrants, a portion of them at least, gradually adopted the practice of the Mennonites; as, in general, we discover an interchange of opinions and rites, between these two religious communities.

But, in respect to the Lord's Supper, Episcopius, in his *Examination of the Censure*, was forced plainly to admit, that the Remonstrants adhered to the views of Zwinglius, who, in the article of the Sacraments, was to be revered as the best teacher.†

From this point, a shallow conception of the whole system of Christianity, penetrated more and more into the sect; and, soon, even the dogma of the Saviour's divinity was disputed. Although, in the Confession of the Remonstrants, this dogma, as well as, in general, the orthodox doctrine on the Trinity, is expressed with the utmost clearness and correctness;‡ yet Limborch, one of the most eminent Arminian writers, early asserted a

* Exam. Cens. p. 249. "Eadem ratio est de Pædobaptismo: Remonstrantes ritum baptizandi infantes, ut perantiquum et in ecclesiis Christi, præsertim in Africâ, permultis sæculis frequentatum, haud illubenter etiam in cœtibus suis admittunt, adeoque vix sine offensione et scandalo magno intermittere posse statuunt, tantum abest, ut eum seu illicitum aut nefastum improbant ac damnant."

† Loc. cit. p. 252. "Et hâc in re assentientes sibi habent non paucos Reformatos, inter quos Zwinglius optimus hujus ceremoniæ doctor, princeps est," etc.

‡ Confessio sive Declar. c. iii. p. 14.

relation of subordination in the Trinity. Some of his expressions, nevertheless, may very well coincide with the Catholic exposition of that doctrine ; and in so far they place the Father above the Son, merely because the latter is rooted in the former, and subordinate the Holy Ghost to the two, because, in the two, He hath the source of His God-head, the expressions are perfectly identical. But Limborch teaches, besides, that, in the strict sense, the Father imparts commands to the Son, and both to the Holy Ghost ; a doctrine which is utterly absurd, and subversive of the Trinity. By degrees Socinianism found its way into the Arminian sect—a way, which, it cannot be denied, had been long before prepared ; so that, when the Gomarists, during the first controversies, constantly repeated the charge, that Socinian poison had crept in among the Remonstrants, we must not consider this accusation as the mere effect of party-hatred. Doubtless, this reproach was frequently unfounded ; nay, as regards the earlier history of the Arminians, the charge, with the exception of some subordinate definitions, in the article of justification, can nowhere, perhaps, be fully *established*. But, nevertheless, many among them must even then have manifested a leaning to the hated system of Socinus ; for, otherwise, the suspicion of the rigid Calvinists could not be at all accounted for, and the sequel has well justified that suspicion. Even from the very copious treatment which the doctrine of the Trinity has undergone, in the Confession of the Remonstrants, we might feel disposed to look for a confirmation of this suspicion ; for, if no special grounds had existed, such detailed exposition would have been quite superfluous. Yet, on the other hand, it may be observed, that as the authors of the formulary, seem to have proposed for their object, to

give an outline of all the more important doctrines of Christian faith and morality ; an important place, without any peculiar or secondary views, was, of necessity, assigned to the dogma of the Trinity. The well-known exegetical writer, Daniel Brenius, who was an immediate disciple of Episcopius, even at that early period, openly professed Socinian views in respect to the person of Christ, as Sand, in his book, enumerates him among the Antitrinitarians ;* and in the subsequent time, such doctrines obtained, among the Remonstrants, very general diffusion.

* Sand Biblioth. Antitrin. p. 135.

FINIS.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

VOL. II.

PART I.

CHAPTER V.

DIFFERENCES IN RESPECT TO THE DOCTRINE ON THE CHURCH.

§ XXXVI.	Notion of the Church. Combination of Divine and human elements in her. Infallibility of the Church	- - - - -	1
XXXVII.	More detailed exposition of the Catholic view of the Church	-	8
XXXVIII.	The Church as teacher and instructress. Tradition. The Church as judge in matters of faith	- - - - -	32
XXXIX.	The Church as interpreter of Holy Writ, and the doctrine on tradition continued	- - - - -	39
XL.	Formal distinction between scriptural and ecclesiastical doctrine	-	49
XLI.	Tradition in a more limited sense. The canon of the Scriptures	-	54
XLII.	On the relation of the ecclesiastical interpretation of Holy Writ to the learned and scientific exegesis. Patristic authority and free investigation	- - - - -	58
XLIII.	The Hierarchy	- - - - -	71

LUTHERAN DOCTRINE ON THE CHURCH.

XLIV.	The Bible the only source and arbitress in matters of faith	-	79
XLV.	Continuation. Internal ordination. Every Christian a priest and teacher, and consequently independent of all ecclesiastical communion. Notion of ecclesiastical freedom	- - - - -	90
XLVI.	Continuation. Invisible Church	- - - - -	99
XLVII.	Continuation. Rise of the visible Church according to Luther. Ultimate reasons for the truth of an article of faith	- - - - -	102
XLVIII.	Continuation. Divergences in the doctrine on the Church, shortly expressed	- - - - -	108
XLIX.	The truth and the falsehood in Luther's doctrine on the Church	-	113
L.	Negative doctrines of the Lutherans in regard to the Church	-	118
LI.	Doctrine of the Calvinists on the Church	- - - - -	122

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

CHAPTER VI.

THE CHURCH IN THE NEXT WORLD, AND ITS CONNEXION WITH THE CHURCH MILITANT.

	PAGE
§ LII. Doctrine of Catholics on this matter - - -	136
LIII. Doctrine of Protestants on this subject - - -	142

PART II.

THE SMALLER PROTESTANT SECTS.

LIV. Introduction - - - - -	149
-----------------------------	-----

CHAPTER I.

THE ANABAPTISTS OR MENNONITES.

FIRST PERIOD OF THE ANABAPTISTS.

LV. Fundamental principle of the Anabaptists - - -	155
LVI. Initiation into the sect. Signs and confirmation of covenant -	161
LVII. These sectaries assail the Protestant doctrine of justification -	165
LVIII. Continuation. Concurrence of the most various errors in the sect -	167
LIX. Continuation. Relation of Scripture to the inward spirit. The Church - - - - -	173
LX. Hatred against all outward institutions for promoting edification. Ecclesiastical discipline. Manners and customs - -	176
LXI. The Anabaptists in the form of Mennonites; their second period -	178
LXII. Peculiar doctrines of the Mennonites. Their Church-discipline -	181
LXXI. Conclusion. Special controversies - - - - -	185

CHAPTER II.

THE QUAKERS.

LXIV. Some historical preliminary remarks - - - - -	189
LXV. Religious system of the Quakers. The inward light - -	194
LXVI. Continuation of the same subject. Effects of the inward light -	198
LXVII. Continuation of the same subject. Of justification and sanctification. Perfect fulfilment of the law - - - - -	202
LXVIII. Continuation of the same subject. Doctrine on the sacraments -	207
LXIX. Continuation of the same subject. Rejection of a distinct order of ministry. Preaching. Public worship - - - - -	210
LXX. Peculiar manners and customs of the Quakers - - -	215
LXXI. Remarks on the doctrinal peculiarities of the Quakers - -	218

CHAPTER III.

THE HERRNHUTTERS, OR THE COMMUNITY OF BROTHERS, AND THE METHODISTS.

LXXII. Historical remarks. The Moravian brethren - - -	240
LXXIII. Continuation of the same subject. Spener and the Pietists -	245
LXXIV. Combination of the doctrinal peculiarities of the Moravians and the Pietists - - - - -	252

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
§ LXXV. The Methodists. Religious state of England at the beginning of the eighteenth century. Profound degradation of public morals. The Methodists wish to bring about a reform. Comparison between the reforming efforts of Catholics and Protestants, at similar epochs - - - - -	257
LXXVI. Peculiar doctrines of the Methodists. Marks of distinction between them and the Herrnhutters. Division of the sect into Wesleyans and Whitfieldites - - - - -	262

CHAPTER IV.

THE DOCTRINE OF SWEDENBORG.

LXXVII. Some preliminary historical remarks - - - - -	272
LXXVIII. Practical tendency of Swedenborg. His judgment on the Reformers, and his account of their destiny in the next life -	275
LXXIX. Swedenborg's doctrine on the Trinity. His motive for assailing that of the Church - - - - -	280
LXXX. Swedenborg denies the fall of man in Adam. Contradictions in his theory on this matter - - - - -	285
LXXXI. Incarnation of the Divinity. Objects of the incarnation. Relation between grace and free-will - - - - -	288
LXXXII. Swedenborg's doctrine relative to the sacraments - - - - -	296
LXXXIII. Swedenborg's revelations from the other world - - - - -	299
LXXXIV. Biblical canon of Swedenborg. Allegorico-mystical exegesis -	301
LXXXV. Swedenborg's place in history - - - - -	307
LXXXVI. Concluding remarks - - - - -	316

CHAPTER V.

THE SOCINIANS.

LXXXVII. Relation of the Socinians to the Reformers. Historical remarks -	318
LXXXVIII. Principles of the Socinians, as to the relation between reason and revelation, and the functions of the former in the interpretation of Holy Writ - - - - -	324
LXXXIX. Doctrine of the Socinians respecting God, and the person of Christ	327
xc. On the fall and the regeneration of man - - - - -	335
xci. On the sacraments - - - - -	344

CHAPTER VI.

THE ARMINIANS, OR REMONSTRANTS.

XCII. Some historical preliminary remarks - - - - -	345
XCIII. Doctrine of the Arminians - - - - -	347
XCIV. Doctrine of the Arminians on the sacraments - - - - -	355

ERRATA IN VOL. I.

- Page iv. line 21,—For “from the author,” read “for the author.”
— vi. — 18,—For “symbol,” read “symbols.”
— xxxviii. — 2,—For “exposed by Reymarus,” read “composed by Reymarus.”
— liii. — 14,—For “*Flug*,” read “*Hug*.”
— lxxi. — 24,—For “by Jacobin France,” read “by the arms of Jacobin France.”
— lxxxiv. — 33,—For “as in the cloudless atmosphere,” read “as through the cloudless atmosphere.”
— civ. — 10,—For “filiation of its doctrine,” read “filiation of its doctrines.”
— cxxii. — 8,—For “unbarred her own weakness,” read “unbarred her own weakness ;”
— For “*Dr. Rhun*,” read *passim* “*Dr. Khun*.”
— 47, line 22,—For “a notice,” read “a notion.”
— 83, — 9,—For “faculty of knowledge for the superabundance,” read “faculty of knowledge for the super-mundane.”
— 88, — 18,—For “the unborn evil,” read “the inborn evil.”
— 134, — 1,—For “possesses the first,” read “professes the first.”
— 136, — 15,—For “term of speculation,” read “turn of speculation.”
— 247, — 20,—For “clearly perceived,” read “clearly conceived.”
— 258, — 26,—For “Gordian note,” read “Gordian knot.”
— 267, — 22,—For “how every unbelief,” read “how ever unbelief.”
— 336, — 18,—For “living, according to his own teaching, is present in the Eucharist,” read “being, according to his own teaching, present in the Eucharist.”
— 318, — 31,—For “motions of the Divine economy,” read “motives of the Divine economy.”

APPENDIX.

- iv. — 2.—For "*old Christians*," read "*all Christians*."

ERRATA IN VOL. II.

- Page 17, line 3,—For “*compromise* authoritative proofs,” read “*comprise* authoritative proofs.”
- 21, — 23,—For “*They are only*,” read “*It is only*.”
- 24, — 8,—For “*insane* conception,” read “*inane* conception.”
- 30, — 20,—For “*troublesome* times,” read “*troublous* times.”
- 47, — 24,—For “*burned them*,” dele “*them*.”
- 53, — 19,—For “*Nichilism*,” read “*Nihilism*.”
- 79, — 25,—For “*trust*,” read “*truth*.”
- 81, — 22,—For “*we directed*,” read “*we are directed*.”
- 90, — 10,—For “*working with* human cooperation,” reading “*working without* human cooperation.”
- 98, — 12,—For “*the most higher* functionaries,” dele “*most*.”
- 128, — 30,—For “*apostles*,” read “*apostates*.”

Don. alt. 5. H
na 7

DATE DUE

ROMANIAN COLLEGE
LIBRARY
GABRIEL BACAN

5136
DOMINICAN COLLEGE LIBRARY

v.2

Moehler, Joh/Symbolism, or, Exposition o



3 3645 00047840 7

BT990 .M6313 1847

936

v.2

Moehler, Johann Adam,
1796-1838.

Symbolism, or, Exposition of
the doctrinal differences
between Catholics and

Dominican College Library
San Rafael, California

